



ESSAYS OF JOSEPH MAZZINI.



Essays by JOSEPH MAZZINI  
most of them translated for  
the first time by Thomas  
Okey

Edited with an  
Introduction by  
Bolton King



LONDON, J. M. DENT & CO. ALDINE  
HOUSE, 65 Great Eastern Street, E.C.  
MDCCCXCV

*All rights reserved*



# CONTENTS.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION	PAGE v
INTEREST AND PRINCIPLES . . . . .	i
FAITH AND THE FUTURE . . . . .	23
THE PATRIOTS AND THE CLERGY . . . . .	103
TO THE ITALIANS . . . . .	137
THOUGHTS ON THE FRENCH REVOLUTION OF 1789	177
THE QUESTION OF THE EXILES . . . . .	227
AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER . . . . .	253



## INTRODUCTION.

---

### I.

JOSEPH MAZZINI was born at Genoa in 1805, he was a bright, precocious, gentle boy, developing into a sentimental lad, who in the intensity of his patriotism wore black for his country's woes. He was a student by nature, and when little more than twenty was a contributor to the *Antologia*, the leading Italian magazine. The Romantic school, led by Manzoni, was carrying all before it. With its liberalism, its revolt against rules, its aspirations for a freer life, he was in full sympathy. But the movement belonged, he said, to the individualist school, it had no sense of national or personal mission, and therefore could not found a new literature or satisfy spiritual needs. His critiques in the *Antologia* marked an epoch in Italian thought. Italian literature, he laid down, must concern itself with the revival of national life, and with him Romanticism became intensely patriotic and radical. "The essence of the new literature" to him was "a thought that spoke of country and resurrection and glory." The true Romanticists, he said, "wish to give Italy an original national literature, which



shall eloquently interpret the ideas and needs of the social movement ”

Mazzini's articles soon marked him in the eyes of the Government as a dangerous man. The *Antologia* refused to take his contributions, and two literary papers which he helped to found were suppressed. Mazzini despaired of a true Italian literature in the absence of free national life, he reluctantly gave up the literary and scientific career which he had planned for himself, and threw himself into active political agitation. Early suspected and persecuted by the Government of Piedmont, Mazzini had been, in spite of a disingenuous defence, imprisoned. In the fortress of Savona the young conspirator of twenty-five thought out his revolutionary scheme. The Carbonaro Revolution of 1831 had failed,\* largely, so ran Mazzini's criticism, because its leaders were men of small capacity and originality, selected more because of their years and respectability than for better claims. They were men with little real heart in their cause, afraid of responsibility, tender to the abuses of the existing social system, and being destitute of generous or creative ideas, they were contented with political patching, and ready to bow to any man or system that promised to relieve the crying evils of the moment. Hence the Carbonari had no programme beyond the overthrow of the existing despotic Governments, no social outlook beyond industrial freedom and

\* See Appendix

a presentable system of law and education. Their action in the recent revolution had been spasmodic, objectless, ineffective. A revolution needed leaders with a confidence and energy that they did not possess. It was time for a new organisation, more in touch with the age, with new men to carry out the new ideas. "Set the young," he said, "to lead the revolution, make them feel they have a noble part to play, fire them with praise, give them the word of power, then hurl them on the Austrians." Young Italy, as he called the new association, was, like the Carbonari, to be a secret society, otherwise it would have had no chance of life under despotic Governments. But it was to be much more than a conspiracy; it should rather be a great educational agency. Its members were to act, not as the Carbonari, from blind obedience to orders, but from conviction of their political beliefs. It had a definite policy, not only the freeing of Italy from Austrian and native tyrants, but the material and intellectual and social uplifting of the masses. Young Italy was to be a moral power, with the faith and brotherliness of a fresh and real religious body. There was something in it of the smug and fantastic, but it was a noble and daring conception. Mazzini was young, poor, an exile (he had been released from prison), but "all great national deeds," he believed, "begin with unknown men of the people." He had already a considerable following in Genoa, owing, as the Governor confessed, to his "purity

of character and rare ability" And when, from his press at Marseilles, he circulated his writings broadcast through Italy, the new school rapidly supplanted Carbonarism, and its broad, however nebulous, doctrines, its vision of unlimited social redemption and a glorious part reserved to Italy, the passionate and intolerant dogmatism of the young revolutionist himself, fired the vague impatience of the mass of thinking Italians

To Young Italy, sentimentalist, impulsive, wanting in resolution and persistency, Mazzini preached action The new movement must above all be strenuous, there must be no more fitful, ill-prepared, ill-sustained insurrection And there must be unity, the revolution of 1831 had been killed off in detail It was an old story in Italy, each coterie had got some fragment of the common flag and vaunted it for the whole Lastly, the revolution must know its own mind, the efficiency of a society depended on the definiteness of its aim, and no honest patriot would rouse revolt unless he saw clearly whither it would tend It was useless to tell the masses to attack the Austrians, unless they felt that national freedom would heal their sufferings "The people have come by sad experience to look on revolutions as Dead-Sea fruit They have found an aristocracy of money in the place of one of blood, they have listened to pedantic questions of legality, while they wanted bread and political rights" If liberals wished to have the masses on their side, they must boldly avow that they are work-

ing for them "Tell them you will free them from the tyranny of princes, from the insults of officials, from the oppression of the privileged and rich then, and only then, when the masses begin to stir, point to Lombardy, and preach war on the Austrians."

But it was not enough to promise bread ; the revolution must satisfy a nobler thirst. It must be a religion ; "for we have not the Austrians only to fight, we have our own dissensions and vices, the impatience and hopelessness that come of servitude " Passionately Mazzini appealed to literary men to devote themselves to practical work, to bring literature to the people, to tell them of their history in books, almanacks, secret pamphlets "Emancipate the intellect , in the name of your country and your own glory, march " And before them he held the vision of a new Italy, realising as no other nation did, the ideal of a highly-organised, democratic state, free from diplomatic entanglements, ruled on bold and noble lines in the interests of the mass of the people. Italy would initiate a new life among the nations of Europe, by giving the principle of authority its rightful and democratic basis Rome, which seemed destined by Providence to be exempt from the decay that came to other cities, would for a third time be the world's teacher, and from her would come the doctrine of love, which would reconcile Roman justice with Christian sacrifice . The Italy that was to be must be republican and indivisible. The royalists of Piedmont, possibly even in

the other states, might be willing to attack Austria. The advantages that a royal leader would bring were obvious—the standing armies, the treasure, the comparative absence of diplomatic difficulties. But these might be more than neutralized by the jealousies that were sure to break out among the Italian princes. And there were more fundamental objections to a royalist movement. Even though in time of war the princes might be obliged to buy their subjects' support with constitutional liberties, the social fabric would remain as before, with its bureaucracy and police, and noble and clerical oppression. The history and circumstances of Italy all pointed, he believed, to a republic. All her traditions, all her grand memories, were republican. She had, except in Piedmont, no monarchical elements, no powerful and respected aristocracy, no monarchy beloved by all the provinces. Mazzini saw in the republic (he was willing to drop the name, so long as it was there in substance), the ideal commonwealth, where privilege was forbidden, where no class or individual was left to want, where the expenses of government were reduced to a minimum, where the tendency of institutions was towards the improvement of the most numerous and poorest class, where the principle of association was encouraged, and the extension of education opened an infinite vista of progress. With such a vision before their eyes, the people, he believed, would rise in mass to expel the Austrians. Mazzini always had before him the example of the Spanish war of

liberation. The standing armies might be swept into the movement, but the burden of the war must be borne by volunteers. Much of Italy was admirably adapted for guerilla fighting—the Alps and Apennines, the Lombard plain with its network of canals. Austria could not stand, he thought, before the strength of twenty-five millions of men, however undisciplined.

Even dearer to Mazzini than the republic was Italian unity. There were few as yet who dared to believe in its possibility. Provincial life, in spite of Napoleon's centralization, was still strong; provincial animosities, though on the wane, were too deeply rooted to disappear in one generation. Italy was divided into eight distinct states, with very varying traditions and customs and laws. There was little in common between the sedate Piedmontese and the pleasure-loving Venetian, between the vivacious Neapolitan and the grave Sicilian. The Piedmontese spoke a dialect unintelligible to the rest of Italy, Naples and Sicily had their independent life and problems, and as yet only at intervals showed interest for the concerns of North and Centre. Customs' lines obstructed the commerce of one state with another. Each capital rejoiced in its little court, and clung jealously to metropolitan prestige. The armies were attached each to its prince, and felt little loyalty to Italy. The Papacy was irreconcilably hostile to a great Italian state. The House of Savoy, though it might fix its eyes on a North Italian kingdom, had no

thoughts of fusion with the Centre and South. It was Mazzini's faith that made an united Italy possible. Only by unity, he believed, could Italy become strong and democratic, only when Rome became the capital, could she hold her place among the nations of Europe, and teach a nobler ideal of government and purer laws.

Italy, then, such was his creed, must be regenerated, not by constitutional reform, which would preserve the monarchy and papacy, but by a social revolution, tender indeed to the rights of property, and carefully eschewing revenge and, if possible, violence, but which would leave no place for throne or aristocracy, and whose ultimate object would be the raising of the masses. To effect her own salvation, Italy must not only drive out the Austrians, but abolish all internal divisions, and however tender to local liberties and provincial individuality, must be not a federation of independent governments, but one united state. And to prepare the ground for the inevitable war with Austria and the downfall of the native thrones, a great secret society must permeate all Italian life.

His instinct told him that the national movement must find its chief strength in Piedmont, where Charles Albert had recently ascended the throne. Mazzini published a letter to the king, appealing to him to lead the national cause. He could not altogether escape the fascination which Charles Albert exercised over the liberals, ambition at least might make the king ally himself to the nation, and he recognised the part

that the House of Savoy might play for the liberties of Italy. But the letter (which was probably only half sincere) resulted in an edict banning the writer, and Mazzini turned his hopes to insurrection. Whatever chance of success the revolt may have had, small probably at the best, was lost by delay. The Government quietly unravelled the plot, and a reign of savagery succeeded. Partly to punish the king, partly to restore the courage of his party, Mazzini resolved on a second attempt. In the autumn of 1833 he organised from Switzerland an irruption into Savoy. About 700 Italians, French, Swiss, and Poles were collected, but delay (through no fault of Mazzini) again wrecked the slender chances of success. Mazzini broke down with weariness and excitement, and after some desultory fighting the little army disbanded.

For three years Mazzini lived in Switzerland, more or less in hiding, but strenuously defending in the press the cause of the refugees\*. In 1837 he came to England. Discouraged, petulant, impractical, half-starved, he had alienated his best friends, and was absorbed in earning a poor livelihood by writing articles for the English reviews. Slowly, as England became his "second home," and the struggle for existence was lightened by the love and help of his new English friends, he resumed his old activity, now organising a school for

\* To this period belong the articles on the Question of the Exiles, p. 229 *et seq.*



the Italian organ-boys in London, now enlisting English sympathy for Italy, or picking up again the threads of conspiracy Mazzini's real work was beginning now to tell His attempts at revolt had ended in ridiculous collapse, but his writings were creating the new spirit that was to make Italy But despite Mazzini's warnings it still showed itself in spasmodic disconnected risings, the most noted of which was the attempt of the Venetian Bandieras to rouse the revolution in Calabria The episode has a shameful interest for us Mazzini's letters were opened in the English post-office and their contents communicated to the Neapolitan government Lord Aberdeen in the Lords, and Sir J Graham in the Commons, denied the facts with effrontery, but they were proved to a Committee of the two Houses, and Carlyle's indignant protest voiced the disgust that was felt at the whole disgraceful business Sir John Graham raked up the old charge that Mazzini encouraged assassination, but was compelled publicly to retract

- The nobility and pathos of the Bandiera rising had an immense effect in Italy It showed the volcanic forces that were working beneath the surface, and woke the easy going from their dreams Revolt against the tyranny of the Bourbons and a national attack on Austria were now only a question of time But the inspiration of the movement no longer came mainly from Mazzini Till now the democrats, however fitfully, had been alone in upholding the flag of Italian unity and freedom But

after the publication of Gioberti's "Primacy of the Italians" in 1843, they had to confront an immense wave of nationalist conservatism that swept through the country. Prudent men who revolted from the useless bloodshed of the petty revolts; sensitive men who flinched from preaching to the people a gospel of sacrifice and martyrdom; all who shrank from sullyng their respectability by contact with the democrats; the orthodox, who feared the rationalist elements in Mazzini's teaching; the conventional, who resented its small respect for social considerations; Italian humour, repelled by the fantastic sentimentalism of many of his disciples, the cowardice, that sought the shelter of throne and church; the best of Italian common-sense and the worst of Italian mediocrity—all swelled the growing tide of the "Moderate" party. Though Gioberti looked to the Papacy to redeem Italy, the practical effect of the Moderate movement was to turn the eyes of half the land to Charles Albert for leadership in the coming struggle. Painfully and doubtfully the scruple-tortured, vacillating king was freeing himself from the influence of the Jesuits and reactionaries, and hinting not darkly at the coming war, when the accession of Pio Nono to the Papacy unloosed the flood-gates. Pio was, in his feeble way, a reformer; and the Italians, prepared by Gioberti, credited him with capacities and aspirations far beyond his timid reach, and hailed in him the Messiah of free and reformed Italy. Two years followed of agitation and reform,

Naples, Piedmont, Tuscany, Rome, obtained freedom of the press, a national guard, representative institutions. In the spring of 1848 the Austrian provinces rose, drove out the garrisons from the cities and hemmed them in the Quadrilateral. The native princes had to choose between joining in the struggle or forfeiting their thrones, and not only Charles Albert, but the King of Naples and the Grand Duke of Tuscany, even in a way the Pope, had to send their armies to the war. The King of Naples soon withdrew his troops to crush the liberals at home, the Pope showed himself less than half-hearted in the nation's cause, and the brunt of the war fell on the Piedmontese. In one pitched battle after another they defeated the Austrians between the Mincio and Adige, and, but for Charles Albert's incapable generalship, must have brought the war to a speedy end. Meanwhile the political question was acute in Lombardy. Charles Albert and his statesmen were too bound by the conventions of diplomacy to think of aspiring to the kingdom of Italy. But they were no less anxious to annex Lombardy, if not Venetia. The Piedmontese Ministry and the Provisional Government of Lombardy had both promised that the political future of the province should be left undecided till after the war. But they were only too willing to surrender to the pressure that urged an early settlement. To the republicans this seemed, as it was, a breach of faith. Mazzini, who had early arrived at Milan, had little confidence in the capacity of the

Government, and small taste for a king's war. But he had promised to support Charles Albert so long as his ambitions made for the unity of Italy, at all events, the King was in Lombardy, and the best must be made of it. If domestic questions were postponed, he was prepared to give the Government loyal support, and discountenanced republican propaganda at Milan. He would even have promoted the fusion of Lombardy with Piedmont under the Savoy crown, if the King had promised to declare for the complete unity of Italy. But when no undertaking was offered, and the Provisional Government decreed a plebiscite to vote on the question of fusion, he bitterly taunted them with breaking their faith, and his organ hinted that the republicans were free to preach their creed again. But bitter and factious as his language was, he would take no overt action that would divide the national forces in the face of the enemy. Two months later came the sudden collapse of the war, a series of crushing disasters drove the Piedmontese back to Milan, the city was cowardly surrendered, and an armistice concluded, which left the Austrians once more complete masters of Lombardy. To Mazzini and Garibaldi, what was really blundering and timidity, appeared deliberate treachery. The "People's War" was proclaimed, and for a few weeks Garibaldi's volunteers, in whose ranks Mazzini was serving as a private, defied the Austrians in the hills by Lago Maggiore. All through

the winter Mazzini remained at Lugano, buoying himself with the hope that another popular rising might compel the Austrians, hard hit by the Hungarian revolution, to retire. Meanwhile Tuscany and the Papal States were in full revolution. The Pope had fled from Rome, a Provisional Government had been appointed, and opinion was rapidly heading for a republic. Mazzini used all his influence to encourage the republicans, and when the republic was proclaimed, he took his seat in the Roman Assembly. For the first time he saw the "holy eternal Rome" of his life-long dream. His ideal had become a fact. Free from the priestly rule which had seduced her from her mission, the Rome of the republic would again preach the true religion, the gospel of social sympathy, which was to purify and remodel European politics. A republic ruled by the wisest and best, with "God and the People" for its watchword, would be a school of virtue and love, and its members bound more closely to one another, as the barriers of caste and rank disappeared, would multiply their forces for the common good. Rome fell beneath the spell of the man who had such faith in her, and when the Piedmontese army was again crushed at Novara, and Austria was threatening Central Italy, the Romans made Mazzini one of the *Triumvirs* in whose hands the executive power centred.

The short-lived Roman Republic makes one of the brightest spots in modern history. The republic had

entered on the heritage of the long shameless misrule of the Popes, it had to rule an exhausted country, demoralised by the fierce factions which had for half a generation terrorised it. And yet it succeeded in winning the love of the people, without severity or prescription, solely by the high character of its rulers and parliament, and the wise legislation with which it sought to raise the country. At first the republicans on principle were few; the majority were indifferent to forms of government, so long as they escaped from clerical rule. But passive acceptance of the republic was fast changing to enthusiasm. The bulk of the people, weary of the feebleness of the Moderates, and determined at any cost to have done with a priestly government, readily turned to the republic as the one possible alternative. Democratic and mildly socialistic as it was, it had declared steadily for order, there had been some weakness, but no paltering with crime. And many who had small love for a republic, accepted it as inevitable, or as the one possible instrument of national revival. In some country districts, indeed, the priests kept discontent simmering, the army was uneasy, the civil service was corroded with disloyalty. But the best of the peasants accepted with gratitude a government which freed them from the terrorism of the Papalist freebooters, the professional classes and moderate landed proprietors, from whose ranks came the majority of the Assembly, gave loyal support, the great majority

of the national guards, the shopkeepers from whom they were drawn, the artisans of Romagna, loved the republic for its own sake, and the proud populace of Rome, possessed with a new and fierce hatred of the priests, became the warmest enthusiasts for a rule which saved them from the Pope.

Mazzini can only claim to have continued what his predecessors had begun. But it was the glamour of his noble nature which more than anything else kept up the enthusiasm of Rome, and saved it from a massacre of priests in the terrible days which followed. Catholic Europe had decreed the republic's downfall. The Pope and Cardinal Antonelli were deaf to all appeals for moderation. It became a race among the Catholic powers who should earn Pio Nono's gratitude by being first at Rome. Austria was threatening on the North, Naples and Spain on the South, and now the French republic, which had given itself over bound to Louis Napoleon and the Catholic reaction, landed its army at Civita Vecchia. The French were ignominiously defeated by an equal number of half-disciplined Romans. The ignoble ruses, to which they were not ashamed to sink, were no more successful and they had to sit down to a regular siege. It was a hopeless struggle, but the Romans were none the less resolved to resist to the last. Though provisions were running low, not a voice was raised for surrender. The poor wore without murmur the bombardment, the growing scarcity, the depreciation of the paper money,

and vented their wrath in blaspheming Pope and clergy, in whose name the French were killing its men and wrecking its homes. The defence was made with desperate bravery; for the flower of Italian heroism, noble and plebeian, had gathered to defend the capital of Italy, and it needed overwhelming force to break down the splendid defence. The Government meanwhile was worthy of the cause. It had preserved absolute quiet all through the siege; the finances had been admirably managed, and though there was scarcity, there was no want. The Triumvirs had won the respect of the people by their ceaseless, unpretending activity. Mazzini was accessible to all,\* living the life of the plainest citizen, wanting sometimes in promptitude and sternness, but unslacking in energy, fertile, perhaps too fertile, in suggestions, inspiring most who came near him with his hope and enthusiasm.

When the end came, Mazzini retired to Switzerland and then to England. With the fall of Venice two months later the national struggle had ended for the time. Royalists and republicans alike had failed, and the advance of the past three years seemed almost entirely lost. Everywhere except in Piedmont, and to a limited extent in Tuscany, every vestige of the new liberties was swept away. The Austrians, the Pope, and

\* "Sadly ἄδορφόρος for a ῥήγανος," says Clough, who was in Rome at the time, "All honour to thee, thou noble Mazzini," he says in his *Amours de Voyage*.



King Ferdinand of Naples vied in the savagery with which they revenged themselves on the revolution. Only in Piedmont the young King Victor Emmanuel's fidelity to his oath saved the constitution, and gradually prepared the materials for another struggle. But the Piedmontese government was merciless to a republican agitation, and public opinion supported it. Mazzini realised that the nationalist movement had passed into the hands of the royalists, and though republican in theory as much as ever, he was willing to bow to the majority and work with the royalists, provided that the Piedmontese statesmen would declare frankly for a united Italy. But Cavour, who was now Premier, belonged in many respects to the old school, he and his king were preparing sooner or later to contest Lombardy and Venetia with Austria, but they distrusted popular forces, and as it was obvious that the little Piedmontese army was no match for Austria, now that Hungary was subdued, their policy was to buy the support of Napoleon III. But the Emperor had no desire to see Italy united, it was too much opposed to the canons of French diplomacy, besides he dared not desert the Pope, and he hoped to make Tuscany a principality for one of his family, and place Murat's son on the throne of Naples. Mazzini, despairing of Piedmont, turned his hopes to the South. Naples and Sicily were groaning under King "Bomba's" tyranny, Mazzini knew the manly fibre of the Sicilians, and hoped that

a revolutionary movement in the South might force the hands of the Piedmontese and compel them, however unwillingly, to raise the flag of unity. The events of 1859-60, fulfilled his forecast. The French-Piedmontese alliance had been completed. The allies drove Austria out of Lombardy with little difficulty, when Napoleon's tortuous policy snatched away half the fruits of victory, and compelled Victor Emmanuel to leave Venetia to the Austrians. Meanwhile the war had been the signal for a national rising throughout the Centre. Mazzini and his friends, initiating or seconding the general feeling, had been urging the Tuscans and Romanaguols to declare for unity under Victor Emmanuel, and Cavour accepted the new territories that had offered themselves to the king. Except Venetia and Rome, the whole of the North and Centre were united. It was even possible that the king would break from Cavour's influence, tear up the treaty of Villafranca, and make a fresh attempt to win Venetia. But it was in vain that Mazzini attempted to save Nice and win Venetia by overthrowing Cavour. Failing in this, the democrats looked as before to the South. Garibaldi, landing at Marsala, made a triumphal progress through Sicily and Naples, and Cavour, whether willingly or not, was compelled to accept the South of Italy for his master, at the same time studiously ignoring and insulting the man who had won it for him. He succeeded, however, in preventing the volunteers from freeing the Roman terri-



which has been responsible for her later troubles, down to the blunders and brutalities of her present rule. It may be, that had she risen to the ideal of her greatest son, she might have been spared much of her present humiliation.

## II.

The popular conception of Mazzini as a tyrannicide, who sank the man in the conspirator, is as much a travesty as such pictures usually are. He was by instinct and training a student, the interests of his heart were literary and scientific. His nature was womanly in its gentleness and purity, and though its tender melancholy deepened into morbidness among the disappointments and privations of exile, its sincerity and nobleness and absolute disinterestedness won him the devotion, almost the adoration, of the men, and still more the women, who were his friends. His passionate love for his mother never slackened during the seventeen years that he was parted from her. It was a sense of duty which took him into politics, he was a Puritan in his intense conscientiousness, a Puritan, too, in his inability to see the other side of the question. He had the combination of absolute faith in his own theories with deep personal humility that makes the prophet. His political beliefs were to him articles of faith that admitted no questioning hence he was dogmatic, intolerant, and,

though in after life he learnt to compromise, it was always against the grain and with a bristling sense of wrong doing. He was—apart from the irritability which he showed at times, and which may well be pardoned to his misfortunes—a difficult man to work with. It was very hard for him to subordinate himself to others, he could not dissociate the man from the politician in those he came in contact with, wrong politics to him implied wrong morals, and though ready at any moment—especially in later life—to resign the glory and rewards to others, he was always critical of their actions and only too much obtruded the feeling that he and no other was the true prophet. There was just something a little theatrical in his nature, too much self-consciousness that he represented great principles in the politics of Europe, and a tendency to exaggerate the importance of every little association he helped to found.

Was he a practical statesman? In the smaller politics of the moment, hardly. With all his energy, his enthusiasm for details, he somehow did not make things march. He had little sense of proportioning means to ends. His trustful nature made him often a bad judge of men, and again and again he was the dupe of the police-spy. Not one of his conspiracies succeeded in their immediate results. But the history of the Roman Republic showed that he possessed many of the finest traits of the administrator, and his clear grasp of principles and his candid and loyal character more than made

amends for his lack of some of the technique of the statesman and diplomatist.

And when passing from the more momentary and administrative aspect of the statesman, we judge him by his grasp of contemporary politics, there is perhaps no statesman of modern times who can stand beside him. No one saw as he did the defects of the liberal movement which began with the French Revolution, he recognised as clearly as Carlyle did, how contrary to human nature were the doctrines of the old economists, he saw, as Carlyle did not, that the social movement which was coming must harmonise with liberty and democracy. His analysis of industrial facts may have been vague and indefinite, but his main principles of reform are coming to be axiomatic. No one, too, saw as he did what a ruling force in modern politics the principle of nationality was to be, and despite defects, his remains perhaps the truest statement of the problem which is still at the root of international politics.

But it is as a political thinker that Mazzini is greatest. He was more of the prophet than the philosopher. He was too loose a thinker to be a successful framer of a political system. He was essentially a moralist, and it is when stating the ethical principles that underlie political and social life, that his writings are most valuable. The essay on "Interests and Principles"\* (written for "*La Jeune Suisse*" in 1836) is Mazzini's

\* *Infra*, p. 3 *et seq.*

defence for confining himself to abstract principles to the comparative neglect of practical politics. His critics complained that people in want of bread will not be interested in philosophy. His answer is. The mere talk about material interests will never produce any great change. It has been tried in France and found wanting. It obviously does not appeal to the rich, for reform will not improve their material position. It is equally powerless to rouse the poor, the leaders in an agitation know well enough that they have nothing to gain personally, that rather they will have persecution, or, under a despotism, may-be death. Still less will the masses face privation or the scaffold, unless they have some great principle to give them enthusiasm. A constitutional opposition, or a labour movement, unless it is based on some inspiring belief, will never lead to any permanent result. The evils are apparent enough, and the need of remedy confessed, but the mere intellectual conviction is not enough. Moreover, political reform is useless unless it touches the hearts of the people. True indeed that no moral reform is of any value unless it leads to economic reform, but the latter must always depend on the former. Every great revolution is the work of a principle, that is, the common recognition of some great truth. We must have some principle to reconcile the opposing interests of different classes, to talk of liberty while wealth is centred in a few hands is cruel irony. Now, this reconciling principle can only

come from a sense of *duty*, expressed in the willingness to sacrifice individual or class interests to the common weal

Throw yourselves into politics with all your strength, was the burden of Mazzini's teaching, because your duty to your fellow-men constrains you. We must forget our own interests; our motto must be Duties not Rights. Mazzini of course did not mean that men have no rights; but he was not building up a complete philosophy, to him men's motives were of more importance than the abstract perfection of political systems, and in preaching the gospel of Duty he was thinking of the *spirit* in which politics should be approached. He had the genius to see that men require unselfish motives to stir them to strong action, that they will never rise above themselves except for a great and good cause, that it is only some sacred idea which goes to the souls of men that will rouse them to action that means the loss of ease or home or life. If we could convince ourselves that we are doing God's work, if we made "God wills it" the motto of our crusade, we should never doubt that right will conquer, we should lose our feebleness in the passion of enthusiasm. If, on the other hand, men are thinking of their own rights, they will neglect the rights of others, and there will be endless strife. Brought up in a Catholic country, he had a Catholic's craving for unity of belief, he was saddened and sickened by the conflict of the century; he did not see how, out of this



very clash of creeds and struggle of opinions, comes progress

Society must then be built on a religious sense of obligation. The problem was how to create a religious faith in democracy. Revolutions had failed because the belief in it was weak. The deadness came from this, as he explains in "Faith and the Future,"\* that the democratic party took its teaching from the Great Revolution, and whatever value its doctrines may have had in their day, the time had come for more positive teaching. The Revolution had done its work, it had taught men their rights, had guarded them from the injustice of bad laws and customs, and left them, in theory at least, free to act. But it had not attempted to give direction to action, and enthusiasm was impossible where there was no clear end in view. The social working of the community was left without guidance, the efforts of different sections neutralised one another, and there was no room for progress. Liberty had failed, because left to itself without reference to a directing principle, it led to industrial anarchy, and the crushing out of the weakest. Fraternity was a mere vague sentiment. The present day wanted a new keynote, and that would be found in the principle of association. Associated effort implied community of aim, and that made progress possible. Association, however, must be democratic and free. Free associations of workmen would come in time to

\* *Infra*, p. 25 *et seq*

supplant the capitalist. It is difficult to say whether Mazzini was a Socialist. He himself disclaimed being one, from dislike of the French Socialism of his day, the Socialism of Fourier and Proudhon. But his rather vague economic speculations had much in common with the later Socialism, and his big conception of the function of the state as the moderator and organiser of the national forces, gives him strong affinities with that school. He detested the laissez-faire conception. The nation, as the wider association of all the citizens, was bound to use the strength of all for the good of all, and especially of those who most needed its protection. And though as a moralist he trusted less in compulsion than in voluntary submission to the common good, he was not tender to class interests, when they conflicted with the common weal. The whole association of free citizens under one government formed the nation. The nation was a moral entity, only existing in reality where the education and physical well-being of all the citizens was provided for. The limits of each nation were marked out by geography and history, and each had its divinely appointed task to fulfil for the general progress of the race. Mazzini perhaps laid too much stress on the physical conditions of nationality, he did not entirely realise that its only true basis lies in the free desire of a people to unite themselves into one community, still less did he attempt to solve the subtler shadings of nationality into federation and home rule. But his merit is that he

recognised that nationality must have a spiritual basis, that the Bismarckian theory, founding nationality on race alone, is essentially opposed to democracy, that European politics can only acquire solidity when states and nationalities are coterminous. His doctrine of the mission of the nation, as of the individual, its duty to the human race, its obligation to work out its own contribution to the solution of human problems, his indignation at the Manchester school of isolation, made his theory of international politics a dignified and noble one.

Mazzini's own words may be applied to himself "The men of revolution may be deceived as to remedies, may promise too much in the immediate future, and substitute their own ideas for the common-sense of the masses, but they will never produce grave disorders in society. They take their stand on principles, they care little for tactics, they trust to truth alone. They make infinite small mistakes, but they redeem them by preaching general maxims, which sooner or later are found to be of saving value."

## INTERESTS AND PRINCIPLES.

### I

January 6th, 1836

THERE is a charge too often brought against those who, like us, love to dwell on political generalities, and insist at length on principles, the charge, that we pay little attention to material interests, that we are apt to sacrifice or neglect *facts* for what they are pleased to call *abstract theories*

We are told "You are dreamers. What use to us are all your discussions about principles which can only mature slowly, and which you can only address to a small minority of intellects? At the present moment we want facts, and facts alone. Come down from the lofty sphere where we are not disposed to follow you, to the firm ground of practical work. Leave generalities, descend to particulars. Speak of what we can see, and what is palpable to the senses. Face the question of material interests, would you forsooth profess to make the masses progress by virtue of mere abstractions? Yonder are people dying for lack of food, men who are hungry and athirst, men who have not wherewith to clothe themselves in winter. All your theories of a

social polity, of Humanity, of a unifying and religious faith, will never renew their strength, never clothe their nakedness. Proclaim those needs openly. Teach the proletariat its rights. Uncloak one by one the crimes, the injustice, the infamy of our rulers. Denounce every act of authority that injures any interest whatever, that infringes a single right. Fight, Fight. Shout Liberty in the ears of the People. Revolt is the principle of the century. Then guide it. In the stormy atmosphere that surrounds us, amid the political tempest that pursues and presses upon us on all sides, do not cheat yourselves into thinking that your message of peace, your weak speech of religion and love, will be heeded. Let the Future and its Faith alone. The Present demands all our thought. Consecrate yourselves to it, and do not come and weary us with your mysticism and spiritualistic beliefs."

They who speak thus are convinced that it is enough to crush us if they call us *dreamers*.

And nevertheless those very men are attacked by discouragement, they are silent, or if they speak, they curse. A hundred times they have thought to achieve their purpose, as often have they been compelled to start afresh. All they say has been already said, all they do has been already done,—but never to any purpose.

All the war of criticism, all the opposition of *detail* and of practical reform that they urge on us to-day has been experimented to the uttermost in France. And where is

France to-day? She has fallen headlong from one wreck to another—from the Revolution to the Empire, from the Empire to the Bourbon Monarchy, from Charles X to Louis Philippe. What has she gained by the change? What difference can you see between the censorship of the first Restoration and the September Press Laws? \*

The blood-stained wounds of the proletariat have been exposed. A thousand times have men counted the victims of the deep social inequality that insults the Cross of Christ.

We know now the sweat and tears that the rich man's bread costs to the poor. Yes, and the poor man, the workman, has learnt to plead his cause before the tribunal of frightened Europe, his indictment, summarised in two words, terrible in their energy—*Death or Work*. A people of workmen has protested against the present division of labour, against the greed of the privileged classes. What has been the result? What has been done? Have any remedies been tried, or any great improvements made? To the producer's cry of *Death or Work*, the unproductive and speculative class replied—*Death*. The cannon has thundered. All this opposition, so intrepid, so indefatigable in the petty skirmishes for interests and rights, looked on at the butchery with their

\* A series of violently repressive laws against the freedom of the Press, known in French History as the Laws of September, carried by the De Broglie Ministry in September 1835. See Louis Blanc's

"Histoire de Dix Ans," Vol. IV, c. xi, p. 312.

arms at rest Not in all France did a single cry answer the cry of anguish of the Lyons workmen \* Why is this ?

Thanks to the writers of a whole century,—thanks to the martyrs of many centuries,—Liberty and Equality as *principles*, are to-day admitted in the series of social axioms Independence is universally recognised as the fairest jewel in a People's crown The right not to be oppressed, or maimed, or tortured by the tyranny of the few, or by foreign invasion, is enshrined in the hearts of all as a sacred imprescriptible right But does this advance us further? Not only in Italy, and Poland, and Germany, but everywhere, maternal interests are openly violated, and yet we all are conscious of our rights Ask whom you will in those unhappy countries You will everywhere encounter hatred of the Russian and the Austrian, a clear desire for freedom, the consciousness of right that would justify insurrection, the conviction of the real advantages that would result for future generations And yet they suffer in silence, they bow their necks to the yoke, they do not strive to break it —Why is this?

Because between oppression and insurrection it is necessary to pass through gendarmes, prisons, and the gallows Because to face all that, the consciousness of the *fact* is not enough, they must feel their *duty* to

\* Arbitrary suppression of the Workmen's Associations of Lyons by the military forces, April 1834 See Louis Blanc's "Histoire de Dix Ans," Vol IV c v pp 196 201

destroy it Because the mere *conviction* does not suffice to begin a struggle : that must break forth as the manifestation of a *faith*.

There were men who preached insurrection to those peoples ; who said to them, " You have material interests, those interests are trodden under foot, see that you provide a remedy You have rights, those rights are violated ; see that you assert free play for them " For this they conspired But tyranny was watching. It shed their blood before the conspiracy was ripe, it sent a few heads rolling at the conspirators' feet Then they stepped back A single chance of death outweighed a thousand chances of success They said, " Our rights are valuable, and we should dearly wish to win them, but first of all rights is the right to live The interest of our own life surpasses all other possible material interests It embraces and outweighs them all Without life we can have neither rights, nor well-being, nor riches, nor material improvement Why should we hazard our life for an uncertain stake? Where should we find a recompense?" Such were their words, and if we refuse to leave the circle of material calculations, we must own they are consistent Two-thirds at least of popular Revolutions only benefit the succeeding generation The generation that made them is nearly always condemned to mark with its own dead the road of progress for its successor Itself can never enjoy the result of its travail



Now, what theory of material interests, what proof of individual rights, could argue a law of self-sacrifice, or martyrdom, if martyrdom be the goal that awaits us? Analyse, compare, phrase by phrase, all the doctrines of the utilitarians, you will never harmonise with them the sacrifice of life. Martyrdom is folly to a People that has no stimulus outside material interests, to their intelligence Christ has lost all meaning.

For us, we maintain that there has never been a single great Revolution that has not had its source outside material interests. We know of riots, of popular insurrections, but of none that has been crowned with success, or transformed into a Revolution.

## II

Every Revolution is the work of a *principle* which has been accepted as a basis of faith. Whether it invoke Nationality, Liberty, Equality, or Religion, it always fulfils itself in the name of a Principle, that is to say, of a great truth, which, being recognised and approved by the majority of the inhabitants of a country, constitutes a common belief, and sets before the masses a new *aim*, while Authority misrepresents or rejects it. A Revolution, violent or peaceful, includes a negation and an affirmation: the negation of an existing order of things, the affirmation of a new order to be substituted for it. A Revolution proclaims that the State is rotten, that its machinery no longer meets the needs of the

greatest number of the citizens ; that its institutions are powerless to direct the general movement , that popular and social thought has passed beyond the vital principle of those institutions ; that the new phase in the development of the national faculties finds neither expression nor representation in the official constitution of the country, and that it must therefore create one for itself This the Revolution does create Since its task is to increase, and not diminish the nation's patrimony, it violates neither the truths that the majority possess, nor the rights they hold sacred , but it reorganises everything on a new basis , it gathers and harmonises round the new principle all the elements and forces of the country , it gives a unity of direction towards the new aim, to all those tendencies which before were scattered in the pursuit of different aims Then the Revolution has done its work

We recognise no other meaning in Revolutions If a Revolution did not imply a general reorganisation by virtue of a social principle ; if it did not remove a discord in the elements of a State, and place harmony in its stead , if it did not secure a moral unity , so far from declaring ourselves Revolutionists, we should believe it our duty to oppose the revolutionary movement with all our power

Without the purpose hinted at above, there may be riots, and at times victorious *insurrections*, but no Revolutions You will have changes of men and adminis-

tration, one caste succeeding to another; one dynastic branch ousting the other. This necessitates retreat, a slow reconstruction of the past, which the insurrection had suddenly destroyed, the gradual reestablishment under new names, of the old order of things, which the people had risen to destroy. Societies have such need of unity that if they miss it in insurrection they turn back to a restoration. Then there is new discontent, a new struggle, a new explosion. France has proven it abundantly. In 1830 she performed miracles of daring and valour for a negation she rose to destroy, without positive beliefs, without any definite organic purpose, and thought she had won her end when she cancelled the old principle of legitimacy. She descended into that abyss which insurrection alone can never fill, and because she did not recognise how needful is some principle of reconstruction, she finds herself to-day, six years after the July Revolution, five years after the days of November, two years after the days of April, well on her way to a thorough restoration.

We cite the case of France because she is expected to give political lessons, hopes, and sympathies, and because France is the modern nation in which theories of pure reaction founded on suspicion, on individual right, on liberty *alone*, are most militant, therefore the practical consequences of her mistakes are shown most convincingly. But twenty other instances might be cited. For fifty years, every movement which, in its

turn, was successful as an *insurrection*, but failed as a *revolution*, has proven how everything depends on the presence or absence of a principle of reconstruction

Wherever, in fact, individual rights are exercised without the influence of some great thought that is common to all; wherever individual interests are not harmonised by some organisation which is directed by a positive ruling principle, and by the consciousness of a common *aim*, there must exist a tendency for some to usurp others' rights. In a society like ours, where a division into *classes*, call them what you will, still exists in full strength, every right is bound to clash with another right, envious and mistrustful of it, every interest naturally conflicts with an opposing interest—the landlord's with the peasant's; the manufacturer's or capitalist's with the workman's. All through Europe—since equality, however accepted in theory, has been rejected in practice, and the sum of social wealth has accumulated in the hands of a small number of men, while the masses gain but a mere pittance by their relentless toil—it is a cruel irony, it gives inequality a new lease of life, if you establish unrestricted liberty, and tell men they are free, and bid them use their rights

A social sphere must have its centre, a centre to the individualities which jostle with each other inside it, a centre to all the scattered rays which diffuse and waste their light and heat. Now, the theory which bases the social structure on individual *interests* cannot

supply this centre. The absence of a centre, or the selection among opposing interests of that which has the most vigorous life, means either anarchy or privilege—that is, either barren strife or the germ of aristocracy, under whatever name it disguises itself. This is the parting of the ways which it is impossible to avoid.

Is this what we want when we invoke a Revolution, since a Revolution is indispensable to reorganise our nationality? Do we want to condemn ourselves to ceaseless eddying in the whirlpool where France and Europe have tossed for half a century? Do we want to be always making and unmaking, and be still in a provisional dispensation, be still uncertain of the morrow? Do we want strife, or peace and harmony? This is the whole question.

For us there is no doubt. To find a centre for all the many interests we must rise to a region above them all, independent of them all. To close a provisional dispensation and organise a peaceful future, we must reconnect that centre with something, eternal as Truth, progressive as its development in the sphere of facts. To prevent the clash of individualities we must find an *aim* common to all, and direct ourselves towards it. To make it easier for all to reach it we must consolidate and associate the forces of all. What else is *association* but a conception that makes for unity. And how can such a conception be understood without a *principle* around which it may revolve?

We are, therefore driven to the sphere of *principles*. We must revive belief in them, we must fulfil a work of faith. The logic of things demands it

### III

Principles alone are constructive. Ideals are never translated into facts without the general recognition of some strong belief. Great things are never done except by the rejection of individualism and a constant sacrifice of self to the common progress. Now, self-sacrifice is the sense of Duty in action. And the sense of Duty cannot spring from individual interests, but postulates the knowledge of a superior, inviolable Law. Every law rests on a principle, otherwise it is arbitrary and its violation is *permissible*. This principle must be freely accepted by everybody: otherwise the law is despotic and its violation is a *duty*. The application of principle lies in a life in conformity with law. To discover, to study, to preach the *principle* which shall be the basis of the social Law of the country and of the times in which he lives, should be the aim of every man who directs his thought to any political organisation. *Faith* in that principle is the parent of effective and lasting work. The isolated and barren knowledge of *individual interests* can only lead to the isolated and barren knowledge of *individual right*. And the knowledge of individual right which, where that right is denied, leads in its turn to dis-

content, opposition, strife, sometimes insurrection, but insurrection which, like that of Lyons, results only in a bitterer hostility between the classes which compose society. Whenever, therefore, we desire to do one of those great deeds called Revolutions, we must always return to the knowledge and preaching of principles. The true instrument of the progress of the peoples is to be sought in the *moral* factor.

But do we, therefore, neglect the *economic* factor, material interests, the importance of industrial victories, and the labours that won them? Do we preach principles for principles' sake, faith for faith's sake, as the romantic school of literature to-day preaches *art for art's sake*?

God forbid! We do not suppress the *economic* factor we believe, on the contrary, that it is destined in the society of the future to admit an ever-increasing extension of the principle of *equality*, and to incorporate the fruitful principle of *association*. But we subordinate the economic to the *moral* factor, because if withdrawn from its controlling influence, dissociated from principles, and abandoned to the theories of individualism which govern it to-day, it would result in brutish egotism, in perpetual strife between men who should be brothers, in the expression of the *appetites* of the human species, whilst it ought rather to represent on the ascending curve of progress the material translation of man's activity, the expression of man's industrial mission.

No, we do not neglect material interests on the contrary, we reject as imperfect and irreconcilable with the needs of the age, every doctrine which does not include them, or regards them as less important than they really are. We believe that to every stage of progress there should be a corresponding positive improvement in the material condition of the people, and this successive improvement, in a certain manner, verifies for us the progress made. But we maintain that material interests cannot be developed alone, that they are dependent on principles, that they are not the *end and aim* of society, because we know that such a theory is destructive of human dignity, because we remember that when the *material* factor began to hold the field in Rome, and duty to the people was reduced to giving them *bread and public shows*, Rome and its people were hastening to destruction, because we see to-day in France, in Spain, in every country, liberty trodden under foot, or betrayed precisely in the name of commercial interests and that servile doctrine which parts material well-being from principles.

We do not forget the services rendered to the cause of progress by the political school of the *Rights of Man*, nor the importance of the economic teachings, which towards the end of the eighteenth century, assailed the absurd and immoral *restrictive system* under which governments committed the industrial development of the nation to customs officers, as they committed its



moral development to censors and constabulary \* In an age when the rights of individuals were systematically violated, these teachings were indispensable, and without them we should not now be where we are. But to-day we have passed beyond them, we cannot stand still within their limits without denying the new tendencies which aim at reconstruction. The peoples hailed the destructive work of the past century because they hoped that a new organisation would take the place of the old one, but since then they have been disillusioned again and again, and now they will not stir unless rekindled by a new organic programme. The *individual* is sacred, his interests, his rights are inviolable. But to make them the only foundation of the political structure, and tell each individual to win his future with his own unaided strength, is to surrender society and progress to the accidents of chance and the vicissitudes of a never-ending struggle, to neglect the great fact of man's nature, his *social* instinct, to plant egotism in the soul, and in the long run, impose the dominion of the strong over the weak, of those who have over those who have not. The many abortive attempts of the last forty years prove this.

When, therefore, we preach almost exclusively those *principles* which seem to us to derive from the actual condition of human knowledge, we purpose following

\* *Brisi* armed Italian police with a military organisation somewhat similar to the Royal Irish Constabulary

the way which leads to the material as well as the moral future of the nations When we insist on the need of raising on those principles a structure of belief, in the place of dead or dying creeds, we shall be responding to a prayer of the peoples, often ill-expressed, more often ill-understood, but which has been revealed in many forms most dissociated and dissimilar, and is the historical secret of the nineteenth century And when we say "Rise to the sphere of principles, guide the peoples, now wandering in darkness, to the law of Progress, to Humanity, to God, awake again the moral sense, the sentiment of Duty in men whom others would fain convert into calculating-machines, show a great purpose to the young, so easily assailed to-day by discouragement and doubt, give to men by enthusiasm, and religion, and love, a new moral existence, since the old one of privilege and inequality is dust and ashes," when we say this, we are convinced that every other method of treating public questions is an illusion, or a lie, that political *forms* considered in isolation, and by themselves are, as the ancients said of law, spiders' webs that imprison little insects, but which are torn through by big ones, that the *spirit* alone gives importance to *forms*, that institutions are a *dead letter*, ineffectual and impotent, whenever the breath of popular progress, and brotherhood, and association does not inspire them, that all written declarations are futile where men have surrendered themselves to individualism,

and organised themselves on a basis of inequality, and therefore naturally tend to elude such declarations, and rather seek in them a weapon of defence against others, convinced that no other method can profit the cause of Humanity, the great interests of the People, and Labour, and Nationality, and moral growth—the only things which merit our sacrifices and our labours

Instil into a People's soul, or into its teachers and writers, one single principle, and it will be worth more to that People and Country, than a whole system of interests and rights addressed to each individual, or a war to the death against the acts of a corrupt government

If by dint of example you can root in a nation's heart the principle which the French Revolution proclaimed but never carried out, that *the State owes every member the means of existence or the chance to work for it*, and add a fair definition of existence, you have prepared the triumph of right over privilege, the end of the monopoly of one class over another, and the end of *pauperism*\*, for which at present there are only palliatives, Christian charity, or cold and brutal maxims like those of the English school of political economists

When you have raised men's mind to believe in the other principle that *society is an association of*

\* In text, *mendicità*—mendicity. A phase of the social problem in Continental nations analogous to pauperism in England

*labours*, and can, thanks to that belief, deduce both in theory and practice all its consequences, you will have no more castes, no more aristocracies, or civil wars, or crises. You will have a *People*.

And when the gospel of the brotherhood of all the men of a nation has made the soul a sanctuary of virtue and love, when the great conception of Nationality is no more dwarfed to mean proportions, when it seeks as a basis for its rights something more than mere material interest, interest that always has its rivals, when the mother repeats its pure and holy doctrine to the child at her knee, at those hours of morn and even when woman, angel-grown, teaches her offspring heavenly truths as axioms and principles immutable—then only will you have a nation such as you can never have from sophists who would found a godless Nationality. For Nationality is belief in a common origin and end, and if set up to-day by one interest it can be overthrown to-morrow by another interest more daring and more powerful.

And so it must ever be. Principles, which some would relegate among abstractions, by their nature lie so near material interests, and what is called the *economic factor*, that they involve its practical triumph as an inevitable consequence. The sphere of principles includes and embraces them all. But all material progress is the infallible result of all moral progress. We cease to waste our strength in a petty war, nor try

to defeat interests in detail and without guarantee of permanent success, we strive instead to reach the common source and plant ourselves in the key of the position. The effects of our exertions may appear more slowly, but they are more certain, and alone are durable. The work of faith, the moral work, advances insensibly, like the movement of the hand on the clock, but it alone is called to mark the solemn hours of the nations.

A newspaper is not a work of legislation: it operates indirectly only. A newspaper does not clothe the naked poor, or give bread to the starving: it preaches and insists that this should be done. Now, how shall we work on the reader's mind? How convince him, not only of the existence of the disease but of the need of a remedy? How communicate to him the spirit of activity, the power of self-sacrifice, which are necessary to overcome obstacles? A newspaper, generally speaking is written for the well-to-do classes, and these classes, comfortable in their prosperity, have never experienced privation or suffering, they see at times the misery of the poor, but easily accustom themselves to consider it as a sad social *necessity*, and leave to future generations the care of finding a remedy. Sweet are indifference and oblivion to the man who sits in the sanctuary of his family, surrounded by smiling faces, while the wintry blast blows without, and the snowflakes, swift and fine, beat against the panes of a double window. Do you hope to drag

these favourites of the world from their apathy, by the simple expression of the *economic situation* and what should be its substitute in a well-organised society? Do you hope to shake them from their selfish repose, merely by cold analysis of what happens in a sphere to which they never penetrate? They will approve perhaps in theory your utilitarian doctrines; but do not ask them to promote them. Why should they? You speak in the name of *interests*. Is not the first of all interests enjoyment? And they do enjoy.

There is a great gulf between approving a thing and sacrificing yourself for it, a gulf which you with your methods cannot cross. And yet this is just the problem. Man is *thought* and *action*. Your theories may modify the former, they cannot create the latter.

We must therefore modify, reform, transform, the whole man into a unity of life. We must teach him not *right* but *duty*, awaken to better things his degenerate nature, his half-exhausted soul, his drooping enthusiasm, we must give him the consciousness of human worth and men's mission here below, and thereby raise the strength to act which now is crushed by his indifference. And this is a work for principles, and belief, and religious thought, and *faith*.

This was the work of Jesus. He did not try to save a dying world by criticism. He did not speak of interests

to men whose souls were poisoned by the cult of  
• interests 'He preached in God's holy name, certain  
truths till then unknown, and these few truths, which  
now after eighteen centuries we are striving to realise,  
changed the face of the world One single spark of  
faith achieved what all the sophisms of the philosophic  
schools had never caught a glimpse of.—a forward step  
in the Education of the Human Race

The problem of to day—we shall never weary of  
repeating—is, as in the days of Christ, an *educational*  
*problem* But what is Education unless it rest upon  
principles, and draw its being from a common faith, and  
strive for its victory?

## FAITH AND THE FUTURE



"Faith and the Future" was written in French at Bienné in 1835, at a time when Louis Philippe had thrown off the mask and frankly broken with the democratic movement to which he owed his throne. Its object was to hearten the popular party, dispirited with the failure of the revolution of 1830, and to urge them to push forward the revolutionary agitation. The parliamentary strategy of 1815-30, a policy of compromise and small reforms, had failed, it had only exposed the defects of the existing system, without suggesting a better substitute. The constitutional reformers had been defeated by their own doubts and fears, the democratic party must reproduce the enthusiasm, the unflinching adhesion to principle, of the Great Revolution. It must cut itself clear from conventions and prejudices, and boldly avow a republican policy. Not that the mere form of republican institutions had any magic in it. The world needed the republican spirit, the essence of which was the devotion of the individual to the common good, and which found its outward expression in the substitution of associated effort for individual enterprise. Men who had a great principle like this to assert could not be patient or silent, and in Italy and Poland and Germany, where the press was gagged, and public agitation led to the scaffold, there was no road but that of open conflict with the government. Not that Mazzini, as he was careful to explain in a later note, advocated feverish, ill-considered, insurrectionary movements, the education of the secret press and the secret society must precede revolution.

## FAITH AND THE FUTURE.

### I

THE crusade is being organised The monarchy arrays itself for battle It has returned to the dictatorial habits of Louis XIV and is preparing *coups d'état* with the arms of the sixteenth century.

In the midst of the great popular excitement of 1830 the monarchy was distraught for a moment, and thought its doom had come In truth we, and we alone, saved it from its doom We lost a marvellous opportunity We forgot that the morrow of victory is much more perilous than its eve Intoxicated with triumph and pride, we pitched our tents when we ought to have hastened on, and like thoughtless children, we betook ourselves to play with the arms of those we had vanquished. Diplomacy lay well-nigh crushed under the popular barricades, and yet we welcomed it as a friend into our ranks, we made its arts ours, and, raming notes and protocols, learned to ape our discomfited masters Like the condottieri of old, we sent back free and armed the prisoners of battle The monarchy was stretched low and at our mercy, and we, like

medieval knights, we republicans, drew back two paces as though to give it an opportunity to remount Coldly calculating, it took advantage of our chivalrous ardour to begin its work again, a work undertaken with a constancy and unity of conception that should make us blush at our discords and slackness

While we were numbering our dead, they began silently to increase their ranks While we were disputing among ourselves whether to march in the name of '91 or of '93, of Robespierre or of Babœuf, they were marching on, slowly, silently, caressing some, threatening others, working their way underground when they thought themselves not powerful enough to venture into the light of day, avoiding obstacles they could not overcome Instead of snatching from the grave a shred or so of the banner of the past, they clothed the whole past with a semblance of life, and re-decked it with the colours of the future Anger, ambition, jealousy, everything yielded to the one end of gaining Power In the North the form was given up to preserve the substance, and the habits of despotism were renounced that the monarchy of the usurper might fraternise with the monarchy of divine right In the South they knelt in the mire, and suffered the insults of diplomacy, to obtain from it peace and help To-day the alliance is concluded, the equilibrium re-established between the old and the new powers, and both alike weigh upon us The enemies of progress touch the

apogee of power Corruption has conquered souls that fear could not reach, gold has finished the work of the prisons. Consciences have been bought and sold, genius prostituted, anarchy sown among thinkers, crosses and pensions showered upon some, proscriptions and terrors upon others, the bourgeoisie has been seduced by trickery, suspicion sown broadcast, espionage raised to a system The monarchy in the pride of its strength has cast the cloak aside, and to-day impiously denies God, Progress, the People, Humanity With the constable\* on one side and the executioner on the other, it wipes out our right to free movement and to the future, it destroys our memories and hopes, puts brute force in the place of ideas, bids us to our knees as it bade our fathers when they were serfs, when thought was banned, intellect and conscience dumb, and silence the law for all And we, what shall we do? Shall we give way to despair? Shall we renounce for a time our battle-cry, frank, loyal, strenuous as our soul? Repeat the fifteen-years' comedy? Show that we are tamed? Deceive the monarchy which we could, and would not, vanquish? Copy its methods, its habits, its tactics? Lead it smilingly by tortuous ways, to the precipice's edge, then suddenly unmask ourselves, stab it in the back, and hurl it down the abyss?

Men who adopt and counsel such as the only policy left to us, who preach patience as the sole remedy for

\* See Note p 16

our ills, or who admit the necessity of the struggle but leave the powers that be to begin it, such men do not, I believe, understand the present state of affairs. They change a call to create into a call to oppose. They falsify the stamp of the age, they betray unconsciously the cause they seek to further, they forget that the task assigned to the nineteenth century is one whose very essence it is to create, initiate, make new, one which only free spontaneous action and a free and daring conscience can complete.

It is not enough to drag a monarchy to the abyss we must be prepared to fill up that abyss, fill it up for ever, and on it raise a lasting edifice. Monarchies can be un-made and re-made in a day. The mighty hand of Napoleon overturned half a score, but monarchy still lives, and greeted his grave with a smile of triumph. In 1830, a throne of eight centuries vanished under three blows struck by the people, and yet we to-day are proscribed by a monarchy which has risen from its ruins. Let us never forget this.

What was called *the fifteen-years' comedy* was played in France wondrous well. The skillful and flawless jesuitry of the actors might merit the envy of crowned heads. What were the consequences?

The *fifteen-years' comedy* killed the monarchy of the elder branch of the Bourbons, but it killed at the same time the frank, austere, revolutionary energy which had placed France at the head of the nations

of Europe While it doomed the powers that be to sleepless dread, it doomed the advanced party in France to a long role of dishonesty. For, through it, hypocrisy wormed itself into the souls of men, calculation took the place of enthusiasm, the brain superseded the heart, and theories of passive resistance succeeded to the genius that ever presses forward to things new. The masculine, vigorous national thought languished under a multitude of petty, bastard, incomplete conceits, and apostasy entered the sphere of political life. That disloyal, treacherous war of subterfuges spread over French civilisation a stratum of corruption whose results last to this day. Another such war would be fatal indeed. Here is matter for reflection. When the times are ripe for breaking from the present and advancing towards the future, all hesitation is fatal. It unnerves and dissolves. Rapid movement is the secret of all great victories. When the consequences of a principle are exhausted, and the edifice which has sheltered us for centuries threatens to fall, we should shake the dust from our feet and hasten elsewhere. Life is outside. Within, there is but the cold, benumbing air of the tomb, scepticism wandering among the ruins, egotism following in its track, then, isolation and death.

And to-day the times *are* ripe. The consequences of the principle of *individualism* which dominated the past are exhausted. The monarchy has reached its

second restoration and finds no more creative virtue in itself, its life is but a wretched plagiarism. Show me if you can, a single important act, a single sign of European life, that does not proceed from the *social* principle, which does not depend upon the *people*, the king of the future. The old world can only *resist*, its remaining strength is but the strength of passive resistance. The aristocracies of to-day are but corpses, now and again galvanised into motion. Monarchy is the reflection, the shadow of a life that has passed away. Since 1814 the future calls to us. For twenty-two years the people, eager for a step forward, strain their ears for that cry. And would you travel once more over the old ground, fall back, begin again a task that is done, copy the past, and, because the monarchy is in its dotage, return to infancy?

What do you hope for when you beg inspiration in the enemy's camp, and follow in its footsteps? Whither will you fare along the tortuous road of revolutionary diplomacy over which you would drag the younger generation? Beware! the roads of mere *opposition* such as yours lead only to monarchy. There exists generally an essential relation between the means and the end, and constitutional tactics can only result in constitutional changes. The fifteen years' opposition gave birth to 1830. Every analogous opposition will (unforeseen circumstances apart) give birth to similar results. In 1830 the

people confined within the Charter the limits of the attack, because it had used itself to confine in the same bounds the limits of the defence. It will be ever the same. If, in the old revolution, the French people angrily answered the challenge of the allied monarchies of Europe by beheading a king and raising the republican banner, that challenge, we must never forget, was unprovoked and a war to the death. Of the members of the royal family, some were in arms against France on the frontier, others were persistent conspirators against her in Paris. Without these causes the revolution would never have reached so easily that state of things. The impulse given by the demands of the States-General would not have passed beyond the movement of '91. But monarchical Europe to-day wages no open war of arms against the revolutions of a people thirty millions strong: she offers them a traitor's hand, and the kiss of Judas. She does not challenge them to battle: she tries to dishonour them. Then she creates a solitude about them; surrounds them like scorpions with a circle of fire, and in that circle they consume their own strength, and since the life of revolutions consists in growth, they perish.

But suppose it happen otherwise, suppose the people, outstripping the first impulse, wipe out a principle instead of simply modifying it, suppose they change a monarchical revolution into a republican one, and attain the purpose you have at heart. You will then have gained



the form, not the habits, customs, ideas, beliefs, of a republic. The people which moves not from faith but by simple reaction against the abuses of monarchy, will preserve the antecedents, the traditions, the education of the monarchy you will have the form of a republic, but the substance of a monarchy. Questions of *political* organisation will overlay the true, the supreme question, which is a *moral* and a *social* one

Criticism will not regenerate the peoples. Criticism is powerful to dissolve, not to create. Criticism is incapable of passing beyond the theory of the *individual*, and the triumph of *individualism* can only engender a revolution for protestantism and liberty. Far otherwise is the republic. The republic, as I at least understand it, means association, of which liberty is only an element, a necessary antecedent. It means association, a new philosophy of life, a divine Ideal that shall move the world, the only means of regeneration vouchsafed to the human race. Opposition is an instrument of mere criticism. It kills, it does not give life. And when it declares a principle to be dead, it takes its seat upon the dead body and stirs no further. Only a new Ideal can thrust the corpse aside, and move forward in search of a new life. For this reason the revolution of '89, a revolution essentially protestant in its character, ended by enthroning criticism, by affirming the brotherhood of individuals, by organising liberty. And by reason of this the revolution of 1830—a revolution purely of

opposition—proved itself from the first incapable of translating into action, that *social* conception of which it had distant glimpses. Opposition can only demonstrate the barrenness, the decadence, the exhaustion of a principle. Beyond, for it, there is the void, whereon men build not. A republic is not planted upon a demonstration *ad absurdum*. Direct proof is indispensable. Authoritative Truth alone can give us salvation.

## II.

Two things are essential to future progress. the manifestation of a principle, and its incarnation in deeds. Apostles of a faith which aims at construction, we cannot advance save with banners unfurled, confronting the hostile faith, in deadly battle. Wait, they say. But for what? For opportunities? But what are opportunities save a special arrangement of the circumstances whose office it is to give birth to deeds? And whence can opportunities arise except from our own efforts? Do you want War? Whom will the combatants be drawn from? From those who are marching in full accord, peoples who have even now renewed a covenant of brotherhood, who have one end in view, one enemy, one fear? Will it be against peoples prostrate in the mire? War will never arise in Europe except by insurrection. Do you want *coups d'état*? Only a strenuous, obstinate struggle can make them inevitable. But how maintain the struggle? By conspiracy? The preachers of

patience object, even as they object to insurrection. By the printing press? The governments kill it you have everywhere laws which fetter it, censors who vex the writer, judges who condemn thought and shut it within prison walls Can you surmount these obstacles? In France perhaps But take the case of a country absolutely without a Press, without a Parliament or a Council where politics may be discussed, without literary Journals, without a national theatre, without popular education, without foreign books Suppose that country to suffer, suffer terribly, the upper and middle classes as well as the mass of its people, from poverty, from domestic and foreign oppression, from constant violation of the national principle, and the absence of all intellectual and industrial development. What is that country to do? Whence can arise that slow and gradual progress which you admire?

And yet that country does exist Its name is Italy, Poland, and for some time, Germany It embraces nearly two-thirds of Europe

Look at Italy!

In her there is neither progress, nor any chance of progress, save by revolution. Tyranny has raised an impenetrable wall along her frontier A triple army of spies, of customs-officers, and of constabulary,\* holds nightly and daily vigil to prevent the circulation of

\* See note to page 16

thought. Mutual instruction\* is prescribed. The universities are closed or enslaved. The penalty of death hangs not only over those who print clandestinely, but over those who possess or read the forbidden book.

The introduction of independent foreign newspapers is forbidden. Intelligence perishes in infancy for lack of nourishment. Young men sell their faith for self-indulgence, or waste their strength in fits of barren cynicism. They oscillate between Don Juan and Timon. And privileged souls, souls afire for Right, who for an instant caught glimpses of the Future, when environment weighs heavy upon them, let their light go out, and perish, without an object, without a mission, like flowers unwatered or the Peri shorn of her wings. Who, I ask again, shall give progress to this people? Who shall give it to Poland, who lies in equal case? Who shall give it to Germany whose lot will soon be the same, when, in obedience to your counsels, her patriots have stayed the struggle which peoples indeed the prisons, but awakens, little by little, the masses? How may we introduce into those countries the undefined but sacred thought invoked by all, if we are influenced by personal calculations, and draw back in face of the danger, if we dare not with arms in our hands, like the smugglers of the Pyrenees, defend the contraband of the intellect?

Insurrection. I see for those peoples no other

\* *I.e.*,—The Bell Lancaster system of teaching

possible counsel insurrection as soon as circumstances allow insurrection, strenuous, ubiquitous the insurrection of the masses the holy war of the oppressed the republic to make republicans the people in action to initiate progress Let the insurrection announce with its awful voice the decrees of God let it clear and level the ground on which its own immortal structure shall be raised Let it, like the Nile, flood all the country that it is destined to make fertile We speak here especially for those who lie at the base of the European social system—for those who wander in darkness condemned to silence by a double tyranny, while others more privileged can walk illumined by the sun, and discern clearly the end of the common labour—for enslaved races who for long centuries have sought in vain the mission assigned to them by God—for Poland, for Hungary, for Italy, for Spain, a country of great destinies, to-day wasting its strength between two systems, each one the translation of a false principle—for Germany also, poor, sacred Germany, who awoke us all with Luther's manly voice, for whom to-day we can only show a sympathy so lukewarm as to show like indifference We speak for all, because all are indispensable elements of the European commonweal that is to be—because above and beyond the special mission which each of us is called to fulfil on earth, there is a common mission which embraces all Humanity—because we fail to see

that men have as yet duly realised how essential it is that the republican Party should be morally united by the apostolic power of the written word, and that it is the written word which determines the choice of the system round which all the forces of the progressive press of Europe must rally. We have men to-day, republican writers of merit, who maintain that there is no light to guide the people to a better land except it come from the hands of those who hold watch and guard to keep them in the slough in which they lie—others who are content to implore almost as an alms, some fraction of liberty for the people—others who desire that European association should ripen under the sun of constitutional monarchy, who reject as dangerous any attempt at regeneration by means of a great religious principle, who protest against every bold movement of the people as inopportune and ineffectual, against every really creative belief displayed by the defenders of the people. And I protest against the false theory, which confounds the material expression of progress with progress itself, and redoubles, as it were, the burdens of the peoples, by condemning them to an *initiation* by degrees, parallel to the stages of suffering they have passed through.

No. those peoples will sink to the depths of hell in their fall, but if they rise, they will attain to heaven.

Nations are initiated into the worship of liberty by the sufferings of servitude. They have endured beyond

words, when they rise, they will grow, beyond all imagination, to a giant's stature. Their grief was blessed. Every tear taught them a truth. Every year of martyrdom prepared them for an absolute redemption. They have drained the cup to the dregs. Nothing is left to them but to dash it to pieces.

What then is to be done?

(1) Preach! fight! act!

The republican Party must change neither attitude nor language. Every modification introduced, for dubious tactical reasons, into its conditions of life, would bring it from its high estate to a mere political party. Now the republican Party is not a political party; it is an essentially religious party. It has its faith, its doctrine, its martyrs from Spartacus onwards, and it must have doctrine inviolable, authority infallible, the martyr's spirit and call to self-sacrifice. Forgetfulness of this duty, imitation of the monarchy or aristocracy, the substitution of negations for positive beliefs, have often wrecked it. The *Idea*, the religious thought, of which it is, even unconsciously, a manifestation on earth, has raised it to giant stature when all men said that it had gone for ever. We must not forget that political parties fall and die; religious parties never die, except when the victory is won, when their vital principle has attained its full development, and become identified with the progress of civilisation and of morals. Then, but not till then, in the heart of the people, or

in the brain of some individual, powerful by virtue of genius and love, God plants a new thought, vaster and more fruitful than that which is passing away, the centre of faith advances a step, and only those who gather around it constitute the party of the future.

The republican Party need not fear for the final issue of its mission, or be discouraged for temporary defeats that do not affect the main body, and only concentrate around it the combatants who, in the heat of battle, have strayed too far away, or fear because at every turn, men try to set up might for right, matter for spirit. The danger is elsewhere.

Having regard to the essence of things, and without reference to the passing hour or the men of our day, the position of the republican party is, by reason of the recent persecutions, better than before. The law of 9th of September\* which was to prove fatal to us, has given representative monarchy its death-blow. It has settled the eternal question between the citizen monarchy and the dynastic opposition. It has discredited systems which professed to reconcile the sovereignty of the people and the irresponsibility of its deputies, continued progress and the immobility of an hereditary power. It has demonstrated the impotence of the *doctrinaire* and destroyed political eclecticism. The period of transition, which unnerved the combatants by deceptive hopes and foolish terrors, is at an end. Slaves or victors. "To be

\* See note to p 5



or not to be" the question is now clearly stated in these terms we must choose between debasing our nature and intelligence and become renegades to every sacred idea, every powerful conception, or rising in open war and appealing from the justice of kings to the justice of peoples, to the *judgment of God*. The truce is broken for ever. People and monarchy are to-day enemies, enemies confessed and beyond recall. On one side Monarchy, its centuries of life in the past, its traditional authority, its sicarii, its tax-gatherers, its constabulary\*, on the other, the people, its centuries in the future, its instinct of new things, its immortal youth, its countless hosts. The jousts are cleared for the two combatants. The battle may begin at any moment.

### III

"You are deceived," they tell us. "The peoples lack faith. The masses lie torpid. So used are they to wear chains that they have lost the habit of motion. You have to do with helots, not with men. How will you drag them to battle, and keep them in the field? Many a time have we called them to arms, *we* have raised the cry of 'people, liberty, vengeance!' and they lifted for a moment their drowsy heads, and then fell back into their old torpor. They saw the funeral procession of our martyrs pass by, knew not that their rights, their life, their salvation, were being buried with them. They follow

\* See note to page 16

riches, and fear condemns them to stand still. Enthusiasm is spent and cannot easily be rekindled. Yet, without the masses you are powerless to act, you can face martyrdom, not gain the victory. Die if you think that one day a generation of avengers will spring from your blood, but do not involve in your fate those who lack alike your strength and hope. Martyrdom cannot be made the baptism of a whole Party. It is useless to waste in abortive attempts forces which one day may be effectively employed. Do not delude yourselves about the times. Be resigned and wait patiently."

The problem is a serious one. It involves the future of the Party.

The people lack faith. But what effects should we argue from this fact, and what are its causes? Shall we affirm a false identity between faith and power, shall we say that where faith is wanting the power to achieve does not exist, that to-day the people are impotent from the very nature of things, that they have not suffered enough, that the times are not ripe, that the atonement—if indeed the peoples have aught to atone—is yet unaccomplished?

To accept such opinions would be to accept a system of historical fatalism which the intelligence of the age has rejected. We should make cowardly obeisance to a fact, without any effort to explain it, and deny the innate potentialities of humanity. The existence of a fact does not prove its necessity. It can only govern the actions of those who press materialism to its extremes.

and renounce the study of causes to lie passive under their influence Will you deny to a man power to walk because he stands motionless before you? The actual condition of things is no measure of the forces which are latent in the peoples Are the peoples essentially weak, or do they simply lack faith, that faith which reveals itself in deeds and sets forces in motion? These are the true terms of the problem Yes, the peoples lack faith, not the individual faith, which makes martyrs, but the common, *social* faith, which gains victories, the faith which awakens the multitudes, that faith in their destiny, in their mission, in the mission of the Age, which illumines and rouses, prays and fights, which fearlessly advances along the paths of God and Humanity, bearing in its right hand the people's sword, in its heart the people's religion, in its soul the people's future But this faith which was preached by Lamennais, the high priest of the age, and which should be translated by others in the terms of their own national life, will it come to us from our sense of strength or from our conscience? Is it an instinct of our real impotence that has banished it from our lives, or is it opinions falsely conceived, and prejudices that we can fight? Would not one act of strenuous will suffice to restore the balance between oppressor and oppressed? And if this be so, are we working to evoke it? Are our tendencies, our manifestations of the thought we would promote sufficient to achieve our purpose? Are we, im-

pelled by fate to lead the movement, or are the masses who follow us responsible for the present sleep of death?

Consider Italy Misfortune, suffering, protests, individual sacrifice, have reached their extreme limit in that land The cup is full Oppression, like the air, is all-pervading rebellion also Three separate States, twenty cities, two millions of men revolt in a week,\* overthrow their governments and declare themselves emancipated, and not a single protest was made, not a single drop of blood was shed Insurrections follow in quick succession Is force wanting to those twenty-five millions? Italy in revolution has strength enough to fight three Austrias. Do they lack the inspiration of traditions, the religion of memories, a storied past? Nay, the people still bow before the holy relics of a greatness that was once Do they lack a mission? Nay, Italy alone among the nations has twice given the gospel of Unity to Europe Is courage wanting? Ask of the days of 1746, of 1799; of the memories of the *Grande Armée*, of the martyrs, thrice holy, who for fourteen years have died for an idea, silent and inglorious.

Consider Switzerland Can anyone deny true valour, the deep sense of independence, of those sons of the Alps? Five centuries of struggle, of intrigues, of civil and religious strife, have failed to soil their flag of 1308 with foreign oppression And yet Switzerland,—that Switzerland who defeated Austria in twenty battles,

\* See Appendix.

whose war-cry would suffice to raise Germany and Italy in insurrection, and who knows well how kings would pause ere they embarked on a European war that the peoples clamoured for, because they know that its last battle would be the Waterloo of Monarchy—yet Switzerland to-day, as the months come round, accepts dishonour and bows her head before each petty dispatch of an Austrian agent

Remember 1813 and the German youth who deserted the lecture-rooms of the Universities to hasten to the battles of Independence, remember the thrill of excitement at the cry of Nationality, Liberty, a common Fatherland, which ran through Germany from one end to the other, and then tell me if the Deputies, Electors, Public writers, and all the men of position who were content to lose themselves in the maze of constitutional opposition, if all these had rallied around the banner of Hambach,\* whether that would not have sufficed to rouse the whole people

Remember Grochow, Waver, Ostrolenska,† and then tell me to what straits Russia would have been driven, if Poland had wasted no precious time, begging help of the

\* The *Constitutionsfest* of 1832 at Hambach—a great popular demonstration in favour of Constitutional Reform held near the old castle of that name. It was an echo of the French Revolution of July 1830, and was attended by thousands of people from all parts of South Western Germany

† Battles during the Polish Insurrection of 1831 See Fjffe's "History of Modern Europe," Vol II c 1

diplomacy who had stabbed her for a hundred years, if her armies had at once shifted the active revolutionary movement to its natural centre beyond the Boug, if some great conception of a people's freedom had called to insurrection the races, whose true heart Bogdan Chmielnicki revealed in 1648, if, while enthusiasm was dictator, and terror paralysed the enemy, while the masses of Lithuania, of Galicia, of Ucraina, were quivering with hopes of liberty, the insurrection had flown from the Belvedere to Lithuania.

I state with profound conviction, that there probably does not exist a single people in Europe which is not able by faith, by self-sacrifice, and by the logic of revolution to break its chains in the face of monarchical Europe conspiring to work its doom—not a people that is not able through the holy creed of the Future and of Love, through the mighty watchword inscribed on its banner of insurrection, to start a crusade in Europe—no, not a people which has not had its chance since 1830.

But in Italy, in Germany, in Poland, in Switzerland, in France, everywhere, men, unfortunately influential, have perverted the original character of the revolution—ambitious and covetous men have seen in the uprising of a people only a chance to slake their own thirst of pelf or power—weak men who trembled at the difficulties of the undertaking, have, at the very onset, sacrificed the logical development of insurrection to their own fears. Everywhere false and deadly doctrines have turned

revolutions from their goal. The theory of class rule has supplanted the people's theory of the emancipation of all by efforts of all. The national idea has been weakened or destroyed by the idea of foreign assistance. Nowhere did the promoters and directors of the insurrection cast into the scale of their country's destiny the sum-total of the forces that a strenuous and inspired will would have brought into play. nowhere have consciousness of a high mission, faith in its fulfilment, and a knowledge of the age and its dominant idea, guided the men who assumed the control of events, and made themselves responsible to humanity for their success.

They had before them a task for giants, and they grovelled on their bellies. They saw darkly the secret of the generations, they heard the cry of tribes of men eager to shake off the dust of their sepulchres, and, youthful or regenerate, confront a new life. It was their task to publish, without fear, on the housetops the gospel of the People and the Nations, and instead, they stammered halting words of royal concessions, of a charter, of compacts between right and might, justice and injustice. They tried, like old men whose natural force is spent, to prolong an artificial existence, and sought in the policy of the old régime the secret of its imperfect and fleeting life. They mingled life and death, liberty and servitude, privilege and equality, past and future. We were bound—though even on their dead bodies—to raise the flag of revolt so high that all nations might read on it a

promise of victory. And they dragged it through the mire of royalty, overlaid it with protocols and nailed its motionless folds, like the sign of a bawdy house, on the doors of all the Foreign Legations they believed in the promises of every minister, in the hopes held out by every Ambassador, in everything, except in the people and its omnipotence. We saw revolutionary leaders immersed in the study of the treaties of 1815, seeking therein forsooth the charter of Polish or Italian liberty; others more guilty, denied Humanity, and made selfishness their God, when they wrote on their banner a principle of *non-intervention* worthy of the Middle Ages, others more guilty still, denied their brothers and their Fatherland, broke up national unity at the moment that they should have introduced its triumph, they uttered the impious words, "Men of Bologna, the cause of the Modenese is not our cause," even while the foreigner was advancing to their gates. They all forgot,—in their zeal to give, as they said, a *legal* character to revolution,—that every insurrection acquires legality from its aim, legitimacy from victory, means of defence from offence, pledges of success from expansion. They forgot that the charter of each nation's liberty is a clause in the Charter of Humanity, that they alone deserve to conquer who are prepared to conquer or to die for all.

And then—seeing the men who started the revolutions pale in front of their undertaking, retreat when



action became imperative or take a devious and timid path, without a goal, without a programme, without hope except in foreign help, the people also were afraid and paused, or rather perceived that the hour had not yet come, and stopped short. With revolutions before them betrayed in their inception, the masses abstained, nascent enthusiasm was stifled, *faith* disappeared.

#### IV.

*Faith* disappeared, but what have we done, what are we doing to raise it up again? O shame and woe to us! Since that holy light of the nations vanished, we have been wandering in the darkness, without a bond, without a purpose, without unity of direction, or have folded our arms upon our breasts like men without hope. Some few lifted a long cry of anguish, renounced all earthly progress, to croon a chant of resignation, a death-bed prayer\*, or they made themselves rebels against hope,† and with a bitter smile proclaimed the advent of the powers of darkness they accepted scepticism, cynicism, faithlessness, as inevitable, irrevocable facts of human nature, and the echo of their blasphemies translated itself in degraded natures into corruption, and in untainted natures into

\* *e.g.*—The German Romancists, and partly, Manzoni and Foscolo

† *e.g.*—Byron

the suicide of despair\* Our literature of to-day oscillates between these extremes Others, suddenly remembering the light which illumined their infancy, dragged themselves back to the sanctuary whence it issued, and laboured to rekindle it,† or were absorbed in contemplation of self, and began to live in the *ego*, and there forgetting or denying the world of phenomena, never advanced beyond the study of the *individual*. And this is our philosophy. Others, finally, born for battle, spurred by a passion of self-sacrifice, which, under wise guidance, would have worked miracles, dominated by sublime but imperfect and ill-defined instincts, snatched a banner from their fathers' tombs, and rushed forward, but in the first few steps they parted Each of them tore a shred from the flag and vaunted it as the flag of all the host This is the history of our political life

We ask pardon of the reader for our insistence on these complaints They are our *delenda Carthago* Mine is not the work of a writer it is the stern and fearless mission of an apostle This mission permits of no diplomacy I am investigating the causes of a delay which seems to me to have its source outside the hostile forces I seek a way of stating the problem in such terms as may permit us quickly to win back

\* See Foscolo's "Jacopo Ortis," a favourite book of Mazzini's

† *E.g.*—Chateaubriand, Manzoni, and, in his early days, Victor Hugo

the power of making a new departure Therefore I must be silent or speak the whole truth

Now, it seems to me that the delay has two chief causes, both due to the Party wandering from its goal, both tending to substitute the worship of the past for the worship of the future

The first of these causes has led us to mistake for a programme what was nothing more than a concluding chapter, a powerful summary, a formula which gave expression to the work of a whole age and its conquests It has made us confound two distinct philosophies of life and two distinct ages, and reduce a mission of social regeneration to the narrow proportions of a work of development and deduction from old premisses It has caused us to abandon the principle for its symbol, God for an idol, to stay the soul's flight towards a New Ideal, that fiery cross that is transmitted by the hand of God from one people to another, to degrade and smother the national spirit of the peoples, which is their life, their mission and the strength given for its achievement, the part assigned to them by God in the common task, in the development of thought one and manifold, which is the soul of our life on earth (2.) The second cause has led us to confound the principle with one of its manifestations, the eternal element of every social organisation with one of its successive developments, and to consider a mission as completed which was only expanding and, in

consequence, changing its character. Because of that error we broke up the unity of the conception precisely when it required a wider development, we travestied the function of the eighteenth century, we made a negation the starting point of the nineteenth, and abandoned religious thought when it was more than ever necessary to revive and to extend it till it embraced every element that is destined to be transformed, and to gather together in one great social conception all the truths that to-day lie unrelated and apart.

## V.

The eighteenth century, which is too generally regarded as a century of scepticism and negations, devoted entirely to a task of criticism, had its faith, its mission and practical schemes to fulfil it. Its was a Titanic, boundless faith in human liberty and power. Its mission was to tabulate—if the expression be permissible—the *assets* of the first Epoch of the European world to epitomise and reduce to a concrete formula that which eighteen centuries of Christianity had examined, developed, made a fact to constitute the *individual* as he was called to be, free, active, sacred, inviolable; that was its mission. And it achieved it by the French Revolution, a translation into political terms of the (3) protestant revolution, a deeply religious manifestation, whatever superficial writers may think who judge the whole period by the aberrations of a few individuals,

secondary actors in the drama. The instrument employed to effect the revolution and to achieve its mission was *Right*. Its power, its mandate, the legitimacy of its actions, lay in a theory of Rights: its supreme formula was a Declaration of Rights. What else, in fact, is *man*, the individual, save *Right*? Does he not, within the ever advancing boundaries of progress, represent the human *person* and the element of individual freedom? And the *aim* of the eighteenth century was precisely to complete that *human* evolution which was foreseen by the ancients, announced by Christianity, and attained in part by protestantism. Between the century and that aim stood a multitude of obstacles, fetters of all kinds on free spontaneity, on the free development of individual faculties, warnings, rules, and orders, that limited human action, the traditions of a force that was spent, aristocracies which seemed capable and strong, religious forms that forbade progress. It was necessary to overthrow them all, and the century overthrew them. It fought a long and terrible, but victorious battle against every influence that frittered human power into disconnected fragments, that denied progress or stayed the flight of intellect. Every great revolutionary thought needs an ideal for its centre of action, its fulcrum. This ideal the century found by *subjectively* centring itself in the individual, and it was the *Ego*, the human conscience, the "I am" of Christ to the Powers of his day.

\* John viii 58

Centred in that conception, the Revolution, conscious of its own strength and sovereignty by right of conquest, disdained to prove to the world its origin, its roots in the past. First it professed its faith. It cried like Fichte: "Liberty! without Equality there is no Liberty, all men are equal." Then it proceeded to deny. It denied the dead past: it denied feudalism, aristocracy, monarchy. It denied the (4) Catholic dogma, a dogma of absolute resignation, that poisoned the springs of liberty and planted despotism at the summit of its structure. Unnumbered wrecks strewed the ground. But in the midst of them, amid all those negations, a mighty Yea arose—the creature of God ready to *act*, radiant with power and will—the *ecce homo*, repeated after eighteen centuries of suffering and strife, not by the voice of the martyr, but on the altar raised by the revolution to victory—Right, *individual* faith, rooted in the world for ever.

Is this all we seek? Should man, endowed with power to progress, idly repose like an emancipated slave content with his own solitary liberty? Does nothing remain, to fulfil his mission on the earth, but to carry the principle to its logical conclusions, to translate them into facts, and to defend the ground we have won, but advance no further?

Is the series of terms which make the great equation closed, because the human *unknown quantity* is known, because one of the terms of progress, that which con-

stitutes the *individual*, can be placed among quantities that are *known* and defined? Is the faculty of progress exhausted? Is no movement possible but in a circle?

Because man, consecrated by thought to the kingdom of the world, has broken through an outworn form of religion that imprisoned his activity and denied him independence, shall we never more possess a bond of common brotherhood, or religion, or conception of universal Providential law that all may take and believe?

No eternal God! Thy word is not finished, thy thought, the thought of the world, is not yet all revealed. It still creates, and will continue to create, for long ages beyond all human calculation. The ages that have run their course have only revealed to us a few fragments. Our mission is not ended. We scarcely know its origin, we know nothing of its final *end*. Time and our discoveries do but extend its confines. It ascends from century to century, towards destinies unknown to us. It seeks its own law, of which we possess but the first few lines. From initiative to initiative through the series of thy successive incarnations it purifies and extends the formula of self-sacrifice. It pursues its own path. It learns thy ever-widening law. Forms are altered and dissolved. Religions die. The human spirit leaves them behind, as the wayfarer leaves the fires that warmed him in the night, and goes in search of other Suns. But Religion remains. Thought is immortal, it survives

all forms, and is born again from its own ashes. The idea frees itself from the shrunken symbol, escapes from the chrysalis which prisoned it, which criticism had eaten through. It shines forth pure and bright, a new star in the firmament of Humanity. How many has Faith yet to add that the whole way of the future may be illumined? Who can say how many stars, thoughts of the ages, have yet to rise in cloudless splendour and shine in the firmament of mind, that man may become a living epitome of the Word on the earth, and may say to himself, "I have faith in myself, my destiny is accomplished"?

This is the Law. One task succeeds to another, one ideal of life to another. And for us the one that precedes us, directs our task and declares its method and order. It includes all the terms that the earlier systems have won, and adds the new one, which becomes the end and aim of all our efforts, the *unknown* quantity that we have to solve. Criticism, too, has its work, but finds its performance in the positive belief of the age. Criticism, in fact, lives only a borrowed life, it exists only in phenomena, it draws from other sources, its purpose, mission, standard. A part of every age, it is the banner of none. The \* thinker who divides Epochs into organic and critical falsifies History. Every Epoch is essentially synthetic and organic. The progressive evolution of thought, of

\* The St Simonian



which our world is the visible manifestation takes place by continual expansion. The chain cannot be broken. The diverse *aims* are bound together. The cradle is linked to the tomb.

## VI

Thus, scarcely had the French Revolution concluded one Epoch, when the first rays of another appeared on the horizon, scarcely had the human *individual*, with the charter of rights in his hand, proclaimed his triumph, when human thought presented another charter, that of *principles*. Scarcely was the *unknown* quantity of the so-called Middle Ages solved, and the great purpose of the (5) Christian system attained, when another *unknown* quantity asked solution of the present generation, another *aim* called for its efforts. On every side men were asking. What is the end of liberty, or of equality, which in its ultimate analysis is only the liberty of all? The *free man* is only an *active force* ready to work. In what manner shall it work? Capriciously? In every direction that presents itself? That is not *life*, rather a simple sequence of acts, of phenomena, of symptoms of vitality, without connection or relation, or continuity its name is anarchy. The liberty of one will inevitably clash with the liberty of another, we shall have continually shock and counter-shock among individuals, waste of force and useless dissipation of that productive faculty within, which should be held sacred. The

liberty of all, without a common law to direct it, leads to a war of all, the more inexorably cruel, the more the individual combatants are equally matched. And men imagined they had found the remedy when they had disinterred from the foot of the Cross of Christ—that cross which dominates a whole age in the history of the world—the phrase of *brotherhood* which the Man-God when dying had left to the human race—a sublime word unknown to the pagan world, through which the Christian world had, often unconsciously, fought many a holy battle from the Crusades to Lepanto. They wrote it on all their banners, and with its sister watchwords, liberty and equality, it formed the programme of the future. Then they tried to restrain progress within the circle marked out by those three points. But progress burst through the ring. Once again the eternal "*cui bono*" appeared. We all in fact demand an *aim*, a *human aim*—what else is existence but an *end* with means calculated to attain it? And *brotherhood* does not include a common social ideal for men on earth—it does not include even its necessity—it has no essential necessary relation to the development of a purpose, that shall bind together in harmony all our faculties and powers. *Brotherhood* is certainly the base of every society, the first condition of social progress, but it is not progress itself. It makes progress possible, it supplies it with a necessary constituent, but it does not define it. The principle of brotherhood is compatible

with movement in a circle. And the human mind began to understand that *brotherhood*—the necessary link between two principles of *liberty* and *equality*, that epitomise the *individualistic* philosophy—never passes beyond their limits, that its activity can only operate between individuals, that it easily assumes the name of *charity*, that though it can fix the starting point whence Humanity shall reach the social Ideal, it can never be substituted for it.

The quest was pursued further. We saw darkly that the *end*, the function of existence, must also be the final goal of that progressive development which constitutes existence itself, that hence in order to make straight and swift for this *end*, it was necessary to know exactly the nature of such progression and bring our actions into harmony with it. *To understand the Law and to regulate our work in accordance with it*, is the true way to state the problem. Now the law of the individual can only be discovered in the *species*. The mission of the individual can only be learnt and defined from an elevation which commands the whole field. Hence to know even the law of the individual it is necessary to ascend. Only from a conception of Humanity can we deduce the secret, the standard, the law of life for *man*. Hence the necessity for the co-operation of all, for harmony in our labours, in a word, for *association*, in order that the work of all (6) may be accomplished, hence also the need for a thorough change in the organisation

of the revolutionary Party, in theories of government, in the study of philosophy, politics and economics, all of which have been till now inspired by the sole principle of liberty. The horizon has changed. The sacred word *Humanity*, uttered with new significance, has discovered to the eye of Genius a new world, which hitherto had been no more than a presentiment; a new Age has begun.

Do we need a book to prove it? Do we need time for the principle to develop in order to demonstrate that such is really the present intellectual movement, that the century is labouring in search of its own philosophy of life? Have we not seen, for a period of nearly twenty years, all the schools of philosophy occupying themselves, even when they stray back to the past, in the search after a great *unknown*? Is not this confessed almost despite themselves by those who would gain most by diverting men from the end? We see to-day a Catholicism that attempts to reconcile Gregory VII. with Luther, the papacy with the free and independent human soul. We have a retrograde and hypocritical party, that gropes dubiously among theories of government, and a stammering mystic kind of jesuitism, which sacrilegiously mutters the name of *social* party. And daily we hear the word *Humanity* on the lips of materialists,\* who cannot understand its worth, and who betray every moment their natural

\* St Simomans

affinities to the individualism of the Empire. Whether as a heartfelt belief, or homage given perforce, the new Age has won its rights over nearly all intellects. Some of the perfervid apostles of progress were not long since complaining, that the hostile camp had pirated our words without even understanding their significance, it was a puerile complaint. It is just in this very accord, instinctive and unwilling as it is, that we find a potent mark of the Word of our Age, HUMANITY.

Now, every Age has its own peculiar faith. Every system includes the conception of an *ideal* and a mission. And every mission has its own instrument, its own forces, its own lever. Any attempt to translate into facts the mission of one Age with the machinery of another, can only end in an indefinite series of abortive efforts. Defeated by the utter want of proportion between the means and the end, such attempts might produce martyrs, but never lead to victory.

And this is the point we have reached. All our hearts and intellects have the presentiment of a great Age, and yet we would give it, for the ensign of its faith, mere criticism and the negations with which the eighteenth century was forced to surround its new conquest of liberty. We mutter by God's inspiration, the sublime words, regeneration, progress, a new mission, the future, and yet, when we try to realise the programme they contain, we obstinately use the weapons of a mission that is dead. We invoke a *social*

world, a vast harmonious organisation of the forces which are seething confusedly in this vast workshop we call earth; and to call that new world into life, to lay the foundations of a peaceful organisation, we hark back to old habits of rebellion, that waste our strength within the circle of *individualism*. We raise the cry of "the future!" with the wrecks of old systems all about us. Though our chains are lengthened, we are prisoners still, and we brag of our liberty because we are free to move round the post to which our chains are fastened.

And because of this, faith slumbers in the hearts of the peoples because of this not even the blood of a whole nation can revive it.

## VII

Faith requires a purpose that shall embrace the whole of *life*, that shall concentrate all its manifestations and direct its diverse modes, or subordinate them to the controlling activity of a single one. It requires a fervid, unshaken belief that that purpose shall be attained, the profound conviction of a mission and the obligation to fulfil it; finally, the consciousness of a supreme power that guards the believer's progress to his goal. These are the indispensable elements and where any one is wanting, we may have a sect, a school, a political party, not a faith, nor an hourly self-sacrifice for the sake of a high religious ideal.

But we have no definite religious ideal, or deep

conviction of the duty implied in a mission, or the consciousness of a supreme and protecting authority. Our apostolate to-day is an opposition of criticism. We fight by appealing to selfish interests, and our weapon is a theory of rights. We are all, sublime presentiments notwithstanding, children of rebellion. We move, like renegades, without God, without Law, without a banner which shall beckon to the future. The old *aim* has disappeared the new one, which, for an instant we dimly saw, is annulled by the doctrine of rights, that alone directs our labours. For us the *individual* is at once *end* and *means*. We use the essentially religious phrase, *Humanity*, and banish religion from all our works. We look only at the political side of things. We talk of harmonising human faculties, and neglect the most obvious and active element of human nature. We are bold enough not to shrink from the dream of a material European unity, and yet we thoughtlessly break up its moral unity by ignoring the fundamental conditions of all association—uniformity of belief and of religious sanction. In the midst of such contradictions we attempt forsooth to make a new world.

Nor do I exaggerate. I know the exceptions and admire them. But the Party, speaking generally, is such as I describe it. Its presentiments, its aspirations belong to the new Age the characteristics of its organisation and the means it proposes to adopt, belong to the old

The Party has long divined the mission entrusted to it, but without understanding its character or the machinery adapted to its fulfilment. Hence it is powerless to succeed, and will be, until the day come, when it shall understand that the cry "God wills it," is the eternal cry of every movement which has, like ours, self-sacrifice for its foundation, the peoples for its instrument, Humanity for its end.

What! You complain that faith is dead or dying! you lament that souls are scorched with the breath of egotism—and yet you mock at belief, and proclaim in your pages that religion no longer exists, that its day is past, and the religious future of the peoples for ever closed! You marvel that the masses advance but slowly along the path of self-sacrifice and association, and in the meantime you lay down as your principle a theory of *individualism* that has only a negative value, a theory that results not in association, but in loose concourses of human atoms, and which in ultimate analysis is only egotism draped in the mantle of philosophical formulas. Your purpose should be a work of regeneration, of moral reform—for without this any political organisation is barren—and you delude yourselves with expectations of success while you banish from your work the religious idea.

Politics deal with men *where* and *as* they are: they define their tendencies and regulate their actions in accordance with them. It is only religious thought that can transfigure both.



Religious thought is the breath of life of Humanity at once its life and soul, its spirit and its outward sign. Humanity exists only in the consciousness of its own origin, and in the presentiment of its own destinies. It reveals itself only when it concentrates its forces on some point between the two. Now this is precisely the function of the religious idea. That idea establishes a belief in the common origin of all, it places before us, as an article of belief, a common future, it concentrates all the active faculties round a central point, from which they move on unceasingly in the direction of that future, it directs all the forces latent in the human soul to its attainment. It comprehends life in all its aspects, in its every manifestation, however minute, it breathes good wishes over the cradle and the tomb, supplies, in philosophic language, the higher and most general formula of a given Epoch of civilisation, the simplest and most comprehensive expression of its *knowledge*, the common principle which governs the whole, and controls all its successive evolutions. That idea is, for the individual, the symbol of the relation that exists between him and the Age to which he belongs, the revelation of his function, and standard of conduct, the flag that makes him able to fulfil his mission. That idea elevates and purifies the individual, dries up the springs of egoism, by changing, and removing outside him, the centre of activity. It creates for man that *theory of duty* which is the mother of self sacrifice, which

ever was, and ever will be, the inspirer of great and noble things; a sublime theory, that draws man near to God, borrows from the divine nature a spark of omnipotence, crosses at one leap all obstacles, makes the martyr's scaffold a ladder to victory, and is as superior to the narrow, imperfect theory of rights as the law is superior to one of its corollaries (7)

Right is the faith of the individual. Duty is the common, collective faith. Right can only organise resistance, destroy, not found. Duty builds up and associates; it springs from a general law, whereas Right has its origin only in individual will. Hence nothing prevents attacks on rights every injured individual may rebel against them, and force alone is the supreme arbiter between the antagonists. This, in fact, was the reply that societies founded upon *rights* often made to their enemies. Now societies that make *duty* their basis would not be driven to use force, once admit the principle of duty, and the possibility of strife has gone, the individual is made subordinate to the common aim, and thus duty cuts at the very root of the evil for which right has only palliatives. Moreover, the doctrine of rights does not include progress as a necessary element it admits it merely as a simple fact. The exercise of rights being necessarily optional, progress is abandoned to the caprice of a liberty without rule or purpose. And Right kills self-sacrifice, and banishes martyrdom from the world. In every theory of

individual rights, material interests alone dominate and martyrdom becomes absurd what interests can exist beyond the tomb? But for all that, martyrdom is often the baptism of a world, the solemn initiation of progress. Every doctrine that does not rest on progress as an essential law of its being, is inferior to the ideal and to the needs of the Age. And yet, the doctrine of *rights* even to day reigns sovereign among us, it rules that republican party which announces itself as the advanced party in Europe and yet—for it matters little if our lips instinctively utter the words, *duty, self-sacrifice, mission*—the liberty of the republicans is merely a theory of resistance their religion, if indeed they mention it, only expresses the relation between God and the *individual* the political order they invoke and honour by the name of *social*, is only a series of prohibitions promoted into laws, which ensure to each the power of pursuing his *own* aim, his *own* interests, his *own* tendencies their definition of Law does not go beyond the expression of the general will their formula of association is the *Society of Rights* their creed does not pass beyond the limits laid down nearly half a century ago in a *Declaration of Rights*, by a man who was himself the incarnation of the struggle their theories of Authority are theories of *mistrust* their organic problem,—an old remnant of a patched-up constitutionalism,—is reduced to finding a point around which *individualism* and *association*, liberty and general

law, may oscillate for ever in barren antagonism. their people is often a caste—the most numerous, it is true, and the most useful—in open rebellion against other castes in order to enjoy in its turn the rights that God intends for all. their republic is the turbulent, intolerant democracy of Athens (6.): their war-cry is a cry of vengeance: their symbol, Spartacus.

Now, this is the eighteenth century once more, its philosophy, its theory of mankind, its materialistic polity, its analysis, its protestant criticism, its sovereignty of the *individual*, its rejection of an old religious formula, its mistrust of all authority, its spirit of strife and emancipation. It is the French Revolution over again, the past with some new glimpses of the future, servitude to old things surrounded by the prestige of youth.

### VIII.

The past is fatal to us. The French Revolution, I state with conviction, is crushing us. It weighs almost like an incubus upon our heart and impedes its action. We are dazzled by the splendour of its gigantic struggles, fascinated by its victorious glance, and so remain to-day still prostrate before it. We expect everything, both in men and things, from its programme; we attempt to copy Robespierre and St Just, and search in the records of the *Clubs* of 1792 or 1793 names for the *sections* of 1833 or 1834. Now, while we are aping our fathers we forget that our fathers aped no one, and were great

because of this Their inspirations flowed from contemporary sources, from the needs of the masses, from the nature of their environment And precisely because the instrument they employed was adapted to the purpose they had in view, they worked miracles Why do we not act as they did? Why, while studying and respecting tradition, should we not move onward? We ought to worship the greatness of our fathers, and seek in their tombs a pledge of the future, not the future itself The future is before us, and God, the father of all revelations and all ages, alone can point out the infinite way

Up then! and let us be great in our turn For this, it is necessary to understand our mission in its fulness We stand to day between two ages, between the grave of one world and the cradle of another, between the last boundary of the *individualistic* philosophy and the threshold of HUMANITY With eyes fixed on the future, we must break the last links of the chain which holds us in bondage to the past, and with deliberate strides move on We have freed ourselves from the abuses of the old world we must now free ourselves from its glories The task of the eighteenth century is accomplished. Our fathers repose tranquil and proud in their tombs. They sleep, like warriors after battle, wrapped in their flag Fear not that you will grieve them The red banner of the blood of Christ which Luther handed on to the Convention,\* to be planted on the slain in twenty

\* The French National Convention of 1793.

battles of the peoples, is a trophy sacred to us all. None will dare to touch it. But let us advance in the name of God. We will return hereafter to lay at its foot, there where our fathers lie, some of the laurels that our own hands have won. To-day we have to found the polity of the nineteenth century, to climb through *philosophy* to *faith*; to define and organise association, proclaim HUMANITY, initiate the new Age. The old Age can attain its actual fulfilment only in the baptism of the new.

These things are perhaps not new. I know this and confess it gladly. My voice is but one among many that preach nearly the same ideas, and proclaim *association* as the fundamental principle that must henceforth direct our political work. Many powerful intellects have condemned the cold doctrine of *rights* wherever they have found it alone and disconnected, condemned it as the last formula of *individualism*, to-day degenerating into sheer materialism. Many schools, some extinct, some still active, invoke *duty* as an anchor of salvation for a society tormented by fruitless desires. Why then do I insist on protesting against their want of foresight? What does it matter if the end preached be the centre of a new programme, or only the development of the old, if men whose cry like ours is *forward!* persist in confounding *association* with *fraternity*, or HUMANITY—the compendium of all human faculties organised to one end—with mere liberty and equality for all? Why

proclaim a new Age, and so involve ourselves in all the difficulties of a fresh task?

Is then our contest one of names alone?

I think not.

It is important to proclaim a new Age to affirm that all we preach to-day on earth is verily a new programme, and, for this reason, that it is bound to be henceforth universally recognised

We desire not only to *think*, but to *act* We desire not only the freeing of one people, and of others through it, but the freeing of all the peoples through their own efforts Now, conscience alone frees the peoples They will act only when they recognise a new ideal whose attainment demands the exertions of all, the equality of all, and a new departure Without such recognition, there is no hope of faith, of self-sacrifice, of enthusiasm mighty to work The peoples who lie crushed by the burden of the earlier movement, will lightly surrender the accomplishment of the new one to the nation that has taken the responsibility, and therewith the glory They will be content to follow from afar, and ask no more And if through causes unknown to them that people shall halt on the way, they will halt with it. And then we shall have silence, inaction, suspended life This is the spectacle that while I write the whole of Europe presents

The ideal of a new Age, which includes a new end to be attained, gives the initiative to the future, and kindles the universal conscience into life By

it we learn to start afresh and not to copy, we work out our own mission, not execute another's, we put Europe in the stead of France. We furnish a potent element to feed revolutionary activity. By proclaiming a new Age we proclaim the existence of a new philosophy of life, a general conception destined to embrace all the terms of earlier philosophies with yet one more, and, working from that new term, we co-ordinate all the historical series, all the facts that are grouped around it, all the manifestations of life, all the aspects of the human problem, all the branches of human knowledge. We give a second, a new impulse to the labour of the intellect. We proclaim the need of a new encyclopedia, which shall summarise all the progress we have made, and in itself be one step forward more. We place outside controversy all the aims which formed the purpose of past revolutions, the liberty, the equality, the fraternity of men and of peoples, we put them in the list of undisputed truths. We part for ever from the exclusively *individualist* Age, and with greater reason, from that *individualism* which is the materialism of that age. We block the roads to the past.

And finally, by that affirmation we reject every doctrine of eclecticism and transition, every imperfect and issueless phrase that states a problem without attempting to solve it. We part from every school that tries to reconcile life and death, and to reform the world by an extinct philosophy. We bind God himself surety



for the sacred doctrine of the people, and its sovereignty We place, in the very stamp of the age, a new title to universal suffrage We raise politics to a philosophical conception We establish an apostolate of Humanity, by vindicating that common right of nations which should be the symbol of our creed We consecrate those spontaneous, sudden, collective movements of the peoples, whose work it is to proclaim the new Ideal of life, and translate it into action We lay the cornerstone of a Humanitarian Faith, to which the Republican Party must rise, if it still wish to conquer Therefore it is that every Age has its baptism of faith, ours still lacks it, and we can, if nothing more, prepare the way, and make ourselves its heralds

## IX

left us, ere he died, the immortal hope, and of which the Christian Gospel is the germ, as *man* is the germ of HUMANITY. On the soil fertilised by fifty generations of martyrs, we hail with Lessing that immensity of future which finds its fulcrum in the Fatherland, and its goal in Humanity. Then shall the peoples make a common covenant, and define in brotherly compact each one's mission in the future, the office which devolves on each in the general association, which owns one Law, one God for all. It is for us to hasten the moment when the Revolution, the tocsin of the peoples, shall call together a new Convention, that shall be a true Council of the faithful. Therefore our war must needs be a holy crusade. Let God shine on our banner, as on our destinies. Raise we on the old world's wreck, an altar where the people may burn the incense of reconciliation. And know we all at least what answer to make to him who would ask of us: Whence come ye? In whose name do ye preach?

Often have I heard such questions. Often has it been said of our little band of apostles: "The republicans have no philosophic basis, no indisputable principle, as the fountain of their creed." The accusers, it is true, were men who think they have a philosophy because some among their followers have made a collection of philosophies, a religion because they have priests, a political doctrine because they have soldiers and grapeshot. None the less the charge was taken up by men of good faith, who could not fail to note in our

ranks a visible lack of unity or of a harmonious philosophy, an absence of religious belief that could not be easily reconciled with the social and essentially religious *end* that republicanism now and again proclaims

Now, we are able to reply We come in the name of God and of HUMANITY

We believe in one God, author of all that exists, the living absolute Thought, of which our world is a ray and the Universe an incarnation

We believe in one Law, general and immutable, that constitutes our mode of existence, that embraces every series of possible phenomena, and exercises a continuous influence upon the universe, and on all it contains, both in its physical and in its moral aspect

Since every *law* requires an *end* to be attained, we believe in the progressive development in all existing things, of faculties and forces,—which are faculties in motion,—towards that unknown *end*, without which law would be useless and existence unintelligible

And since every *law* is interpreted and verified in its own *subject*, we believe in HUMANITY, a collective and continuous Being, in which is epitomised the whole ascending series of organic creations, and in which as the sole interpreter of the law, is most fully manifested God's thought on earth

We believe, that inasmuch as harmony between the *subject* and the *law* is the condition of all normal

existence, the manifest and immediate end of all our labours is to effect the greater completion and security of that harmony, through the fuller discovery of the *law* and its realisation in its *subject*

We believe in ASSOCIATION,—which is but the *active* belief in one God, in one Law, in one End,—as the only means possessed by us to *realise* Truth, as the method of progress, as the only existing road to perfection, so that the higher the scale of human progress the more embracing may be its corresponding formula of association won for men, and applied to their life

We believe therefore in the HOLY ALLIANCE OF THE PEOPLES as the broadest formula of association possible in our age—in the *liberty* and *equality* of the peoples, without which association has no true life—in *Nationality*, which is the conscience of the peoples, which assigns to them their share of work in the association, their office in HUMANITY, and hence constitutes their mission on earth, their *individuality*, for without Nationality neither liberty nor equality is possible—and we believe in the holy *Fatherland*, that is the cradle of nationality, the altar and patrimony of the individuals that compose each people

And since the LAW is one, since it governs equally the two aspects, internal and external, of the *life* of every being, the two modes of self and relativity, of the subjective and the objective that appertain to every existence, we believe for each people and its component individuals

the same that we believe for HUMANITY and its component peoples. As we believe in the association of peoples, so we believe in association between the individuals who compose each nation, and in it as the sole means of their progress, the principle destined to govern all their institutions, and the pledge of concord in their labours. As we believe in the liberty and equality of the peoples, so we believe in liberty and equality among the men of each Country, in the inviolability of the *ego*, which is the conscience of individuals, and assigns to them their share of work in the secondary association, an office in the Nation, a special mission of citizenship in the sphere of the Fatherland. And as we believe in HUMANITY, the sole interpreter of God's Law, so we believe for every State, in the PEOPLE, the sole master, the sole sovereign, the sole interpreter of the Law of Humanity which rules the mission of each Nation. In the People one and indivisible, that knows neither caste nor privilege, save that of Genius and of Virtue, neither proletariat nor aristocracy of land or money, but only faculties and active forces consecrated, for the good of all, to the administration of the surface of the globe, our common heritage —in the people free and independent, with an organisation that shall harmonise individual faculties and social thought, the people living by its own labour and the fruits thereof, pursuing in concord the greatest possible good of all, yet respecting the rights of the individual —in the people made one family, with one faith, one tradition, one thought of love, and

advancing to the ever fuller accomplishment of its mission—in the people, progressive, consecrated to an apostolate of *duties*, never forgetful of a truth once won, never slacking its efforts because of that victory, reverent to the message of the generations, but resolved to use the present as a bridge betwixt past and future, worshipping revelation, not the revealers, able, little by little, to approach the solution of its destiny here on earth

God and his Law, HUMANITY and its work of interpretation, progress, association, liberty, equality, the doctrine of the PEOPLE, which is the vital principle of the republican party, all meet on the common ground of our creed (9) We reject no conquest of the past. Before us spreads a future where meet in close embrace the two eternal principles of every organisation, the individual and Humanity, liberty and association, where one philosophy, a genuine expression of religion, shall embrace in equal balance, every revelation of progress, every holy idea which by providential design has been successively transmitted to us

“When before Young Europe’s dawn, all the altars of the old world have fallen, two altars shall be raised upon this soil that the divine Word has made fruitful. and the finger of the herald-people shall inscribe upon one, *Fatherland*, and upon the other, *Humanity*

Like sons of the same mother, like brothers who will not be parted, the people shall gather around those two

altars, and offer sacrifice in peace and love And the incense of the sacrifice shall ascend to heaven in two columns that shall draw near each other as they mount, until they are confounded in one point, which is God

And so often as they move asunder whilst they rise, fratricide shall be on earth, and mothers shall weep on earth, and angels in heaven " \*

Now, suppose these things repeated in Europe, not as an expression of the individual, but as the expression, the Word, the Conscience of the republican party, of the whole party of progress—suppose the religious principle to shine again on our path and unify our labours—suppose God and Humanity conjoined in our popular symbolism, as phenomenon and idea, thought and form, think ye not that our word would not kindle the doubt-tossed multitudes who pray, and wait, and hope, because no crusader's cry, no religious cry, sounds in their ears? Do you believe that between our HOLY ALLIANCE and the *accursed compact*, between the apostles of progressive free movement, and the stagnant sophists of old Europe, they would discern on which side stands God, his Love, his Truth? And where God is there is the people also The people's philosophy is its faith

And when faith shows not only on your lips but in your hearts, when your deeds answer to your words, and virtue hallows your lives as liberty hallows your minds,

\* The Faith of Young Europe, unpublished.

when as a band of brothers, believers in one flag, you appear before men as they who seek the good, when the people say of you . *they are a living faith*, think ye the people will be slow to answer to your call? Think ye that the guerdon desired of all, of saving power to all, which falls to them who shall herald the way to Europe, think ye that that will not be gathered, aye and quickly? . Great thoughts make great peoples . Let your life be the epitome of one great organic thought. Widen the peoples' horizon . Free their conscience from the materialism that weighs it down . Point them to a vast mission . Baptise them once again . Anger at wrong done to material interests can only bring forth revolts , principles alone effect revolutions . Go back to first principles and the people will follow you.

The question which agitates the world is a religious question . Criticism and anarchy of belief have extinguished faith in the hearts of the peoples . A philosophy that constructs, and unity of belief will revive it .

Then—but not till then—will return that active energy which grows with difficulties, but now collapses at each trifling disappointment . Then will cease that state of isolation and mistrust which wearies us, which multiplies parties, obstructs association, makes of each individual a separate rallying point, which makes us camps enough but no armies to tenant them, which parts the poets to one side, the men of prose and calculation to the other, divides yet further the men of action, and further still



the high speculative intellects Then we shall lose from our ranks those who dishonour us, the clan of unclean hearts and canting tongues, whose inconsistency of language and performance suggests doubt concerning our symbol, who prate of virtue, of self-sacrifice, of charity, while vice is in their hearts, shame on their foreheads, and selfishness in their souls, who nail their immorality on our banner, and hide themselves in the day of battle, to reappear when danger is past that they may gather the spoils of the vanquished and stain our triumph by robbing it of its fruits Then will disappear, one by one, the prejudices and the influence of those nameless, feeble men, who blame our war-cry because themselves lack courage, who beg at an ambassador's gate a dole of hope for their country, who drag the exile's sacred name in the mire of cabinet intrigues, who dream of salvation for the nations from the chicanery of diplomatists, men who ape in their conspiracies the rusty tricks of the police, who mock at enthusiasm, deny the power of inspiration and self-sacrifice, call martyrdom quixotic, and try to regenerate the peoples by statistics Then will vanish the thousand inconsistencies that make the party inferior to its mission, patriots' lips lisping *foreigner* almost as a reproach—what a blasphemy on the cross of Christ from men who call themselves Christians, republicans, and brothers—the guilty hesitation that robs so many of our friends of strength to confess their belief, that frightens them at every charge made from the

enemy's camp, that makes apostles of truth appear as erring and guilty men, that fascination of old names which, by supplanting principles, has ruined so many revolutions, and sacrificed fresh ideas to the petty traditions of the past, the illogical, inconsistent spirit that denies the oneness of mankind, that demands unlimited liberty for some and absolute intolerance for others, preaches political freedom and refuses literary freedom, which shakes the social edifice to its foundations, and petrifies religion. Then we shall see no more the angry polemic that feeds on hatred, which snarls at every reminder, which neglects principles for personalities, which betrays in every sentence its jealous national exclusiveness, and wastes its strength in unimportant petty scuffles, and lastly, we shall lose the frivolity, the inconstancy of opinions, the forgetfulness of the martyrs who are our Saints, of the great men who are our priests, of the great actions which are our prayer. *Faith*, which is intellect, will, love, will blot out all those vices, and end the discords of a society without a church, without a head, that invokes a new world, but forgets to ask its secret from God. And then, made fruitful by the breath of God and of holy beliefs, poetry, now exiled from a world that is a prey to anarchy, will blossom yet again, poetry, the flower of the angels, that martyrs' blood and mothers' tears have fed, that oft will grow amid ruins, but is ever coloured by a rising Sun. It speaks to us in prophetic tones, of Humanity, European in substance,

national in form It will teach the Fatherland of the fatherlands to the nations still divided, it will translate into Art the religious, social philosophy, it will surround with its own beautiful light, *woman*, who though a fallen angel, is ever nearer to heaven than we It will hasten her redemption, restoring to her the mission of inspiration, of pity, and of prayer, which Christianity divinely symbolised in Mary It will sing the joys of martyrdom, the immortality of the vanquished, the tears that expiate, the sufferings that purify, the memories and the hopes, the traditions of one world interwoven in the cradle of another It will murmur words of holy consolation to those children of sorrow born before their time, those fated and puissant souls, who, like Byron, have no confidants on earth, and whom the world of to-day strives to rob even of God And it will teach the young the greatness of self-sacrifice, the virtue of constancy and silence, how to be alone and yet despair not, how to endure without a cry, an existence of torments half understood, unknown, long years of delusions and bitterness and wounds, all without a complaint, it will teach a belief in future things, an hourly travail to promote it, without a hope in this life of seeing its victory

Are these illusions? Do I presume too much when I ask of faith such prodigies in a century still corrupted by scepticism, among men who are slaves of *self*, who love little, and quickly forget, who are troubled in soul, and

heed only the calculations of egotism, and the sensations of the hour?

No; I do not presume too much. It is necessary that this come to pass, aye, and it will come. I have faith in God, in the potency of truth, and in the *spirit* of the age. I feel in the depths of my heart, that we cannot stay as we are. The principle which was the soul of the old world is exhausted. It is for us to open the way to the new principle, and even should we perish in the attempt we will lead the way.

## X

The times were wrapped in shadow. Heaven was a void. The peoples wandered, pricked by strange fears, or paused in torpid, puzzled wonderment. Whole nations disappeared; others just raised their heads as though to see them die. A hollow sound as of dissolution was heard in the world. All creation, earth and sky, trembled. Man seemed in hideous case. Placed between two Infinities, he knew neither, he knew not past nor future. All belief was dead—dead the belief in the Gods, dead the belief in the republic. Society was not, nought but a Power that drowned in blood, or ate itself away in deeds of shame and sin, a senate, poor parody of the majesty that had been, which voted gold and statues to the tyrant, pretorians who despised the one and slew the other, informers, sophists, and a slavish and obsequious multitude. There were no principles of

saving virtue there existed but the calculation of antagonistic interests. The Fatherland was exhausted. The solemn voice of Brutus from the tomb had told the world that Virtue was but a name. And the good withdrew from that world, to keep their souls and intellects from stain. Nerva starved himself to death. Thraseas made libation of his own blood to Jove the Liberator. The soul had disappeared, the senses alone reigned. The people asked for bread and circus games. Philosophy had become scepticism, epicureanism, or mere sophistries and words. Poetry was satire. From time to time man stood appalled at his own solitude, and drew back from the wilderness. Then voices of fear were heard at night by the wayside. Then the citizens, almost frenzied with dread, clasped the bare, cold statues of the Gods that once they worshipped, and prayed of them a spark of moral life, a ray of faith, even some illusion; but they went away unheard, with despair in their hearts and blasphemy on their lips. Such were those times, so like our own.

But, yet, that was not the death agony of the world, it was but the end of one phase of the world's evolution. A great epoch was exhausted, passing away to leave the road clear for another, whose first notes were already ringing in the north, and that awaited only its *initiator* to declare itself. He came. His was the soul most full of love, most virtuous and holy, most inspired by God and the future, that men have ever hailed on this earth.

it was JESUS. He bent over the decaying world, and murmured in its ear a word of faith. To that obscene thing which retained nought but the aspect and notions of a man, he uttered words unknown up to that day: *love, self-sacrifice, celestial origin*. The dead arose, a new life thrilled through that obscene thing which philosophy had tried in vain to bring to life. From it came forth the Christian world, the world of liberty and equality. *Man* was made manifest, the image and foreshadowing of God. Jesus died. As Lamennais has said, he asked of men to save them, only a cross to die on. But ere he died, he announced to the people the *good news*. To those who asked him whence he had it, he answered. From God the Father, and from the cross twice he called on Him. But from that cross his victory began, and still endures.

Have faith then, oh ye that suffer for the noble cause, apostles of a Truth that even to-day the world ignores, ye soldiers of the holy battles which the world condemns and calls rebellions. To-morrow, perhaps, that world, to-day incredulous or careless, will bow with fervour before you. To-morrow, victory will crown your crusading banner. Onward in faith, and fear not. That which Christ did Humanity can do. Believe, and you will conquer. Believe, and the peoples will end by following you. Believe, and act. Action is the Word of God. passive thought is but its shadow. Those who sunder Thought and Action dismember God, and deny

the eternal Unity of things. Thrust them from your ranks, for whoso is not ready to testify to his faith with his blood is no believer

From your cross of misfortune and persecution announce the whole faith of the Age, but few days will pass ere it receive its consecration of faith. Let your lips utter not the cry of hate, nor the conspirator's hollow phrase, but the tranquil, solemn word of the days that are to come. From our cross of poverty and proscription, we, the men of exile, who represent in our heart and faith the races of the enslaved, the millions doomed to silence, we will reply to you, and say to our brothers *the alliance is made*. Hurl at your persecutors the legend GOD AND HUMANITY. For yet a little time they may rebel and strive against it and stammer blasphemy. But the masses will worship it.

There was a day in the sixteenth century, in Italy, in Rome, when men called *inquisitors*, who pretended to have science and authority from God, were gathered together to decree the immobility of the Earth. Before them stood a prisoner. Genius illumined his face. He had outstripped his times and his fellow-men, and revealed the secret of a world.

He was Galileo

He shook his bald and venerable head. The soul of that sublime old man rose in rebellion against the senseless violence of men, who would have forced him to deny the truth that God had taught him. But long

oppression had tamed his former energy. Frightened by the threats of those monks, he was at the point of yielding. He raised his hand to swear, even he, the immobility of the Earth. But as he raised his hand, he lifted his weary eyes to the sky which he had scanned during long nights, to read in it a line of universal law; they caught a ray of that sun which he knew to be fixed in the centre of the revolving spheres. Remorse pricked his heart, and a cry in his own despite escaped from the depths of his soul. STILL IT MOVES!

Three centuries have passed away. Inquisitors, inquisition, the senseless propositions that force dictated, all have disappeared. But still the Earth moves on, its motion proved beyond a doubt, and still the words of Galileo soar over the generations of Mankind. Lift thy countenance to the sun of God, thou child of Humanity, and read that legend in the heavens *it moves*. Faith and action. The future is ours.

---

### NOTES TO FAITH AND THE FUTURE

(1) Aet, I say, but, by making this principle of Action a standard of conduct, I do not mean action at any price, feverish, disorganised, unreflecting action. I mean Action as a principle, a programme, a banner, as that which ought to be the tendency and avowed end of all our strivings. The rest is a question of time, with which



it is futile now to concern ourselves. It is sufficient for us that a temporary necessity be not elevated to a permanent theory, that the peoples be not deluded into substituting for revolutionary *activity* an indefinite, uncertain, peacefully progressive force of events, that we no longer persist in handing over the great illumining power of the revolutionary philosophy, to a spasmodic, coldly critical work of constitutional *opposition*. We reject the systematic want of movement, the silence that broods, the dissimulation that betrays, we invoke the frank, loyal preaching of our doctrine. Ours is the cry of Ajax. We want to fight in the open day illumined by the light of heaven. Is this childish impatience? No. It is the complement of our doctrine, the baptism of our faith. The principle of action that we inscribe on our banner is closely bound up with 'our belief in a new Age. How shall we initiate it save by the people and by Action, the Word of the people? Without this principle of Action, which we take as the standard of our efforts, we should only produce a purely reactionary movement, and hence an imperfect, superficial, material change of things.

(2) My ideas on the French Revolution, considered as the last word of the expiring Age rather than the first word of the age which the nineteenth century initiates, are already indicated in an article "On the Revolutionary Initiative" published in the *Revue Républicaine* of 1835, and I intend to develop my argument further when the opportunity offers.\* I shall then perhaps be permitted

\* See "Thoughts on the French Revolution," p. 179

to prove that, in subjecting the past to a new test, I am seeking, in the historical evolution of the stages of progress, data for a new social aim, a new European philosophy that shall shift the new departure from a single predominant people, in order to communicate to all that activity which is now lacking; that I am not following *nebulous German metaphysics*; but only desire that thought may be translated into *fact*, that the vicious circle in which our activity is confined may be broken, and a decisive battle forced between the two principles that are now struggling for mastery in Europe.

It was said, in the preamble to my article in the *Revue* "Ought we to forget facts in order to improvise, by merely wishing it, a Revolutionary force where it does not really exist? Can we blot out the past? Can we leave out of our calculations the Revolutions of Modena and Bologna?"

Theoretically, the position in which we are placed by our religious and philosophical belief leaves us untouched by any argument deduced from those facts. We are near to one of those periods of regeneration, which, by introducing a new element into the great terrestrial scheme of life, generates new forces and shifts the central point of all questions. We hail the dawn of a new age. The Revolution of which we have a presentiment, will embrace a large part of Humanity. Now, every new purpose calls into action new forces latent in the peoples. But, putting aside the main question, why do

our critics forget that in Italy the *people*—the only true Revolutionary force—has never entered the lists, that our insurrections never went outside the circle of a military or bourgeois caste, that the masses were never called upon to share in the undertaking? Why do they forget that the insurrection never assumed an avowed *Italian* character? Why argue from the *monarchical* risings of 1821 to the prejudice of the *republican* insurrection for which we are striving? How possibly calculate the results of a principle by studying the consequences of a contrary principle? Between us republicans of "Young Italy" and those who laboured before us, between those who desire to move the masses with the cry of "God and the People" and the inconsistent, timid men who forget God and fear the People, a great gulf is fixed

"The risings of Modena and Bologna failed because France did not support them" True How is it possible for an insurrection not to fail when betrayed by the very principle upon which its life was based? Now this principle on which the leaders of the Italian Insurrection took their stand, was the principle of *non-intervention* And blind faith in *non-intervention* prevented them from taking the steps that self-preservation demanded in order to work out their salvation The masses were repulsed, the young discouraged, every force that had a germ of life ignored, they omitted to procure arms, they denied the idea of Nationality, they confined

the area of the insurrection within the limits of a single province. Are these *permanent* causes of weakness? From then till now every Italian who has not perverted his national sentiment in the conventions of the Parisian *juste-milieu*, will reply that if our forces are still sterile, if even to day we number so many martyrs and so few fighters, we owe it mainly to the doctrine that the initiative of the European struggle devolves upon France, and that when she will not stir no one must attempt to move. It is urgent therefore to combat this doctrine preached among us by those very men who, from their resources in means and influence, should be first to take action. It is a doctrine that destroys the conscience and future of the peoples, a doctrine which the French republicans ought to join with us in fighting. I do not therefore blame France. I only ask the republican Press to introduce the new tendencies and language that correspond to the new mission. But I deservedly blame the men who, living in the midst of oppressed peoples, increase the difficulties of the work of emancipation by the insincere belief that marks worse than lukewarm convictions, I blame those who boast themselves the apostles of a humanitarian philosophy, and yet, with their theory of a single revealer and their rejection of the continuity of progress, sink by stress of logic to the rejection of the doctrine of the intelligence and sovereignty of the people, only to evoke some vague revival of the Papacy,

I blame the men who declare Humanity to be impossible until France be hailed Queen of the universe (See *Histoire Parlementaire de la Revolution Française—Christ et le Peuple, par A. Siguier*) And this is not an isolated thought of one individual; it is the doctrine of a whole school. Now we protest against the doctrine of that school, against its national egotism, its tendencies to trespass on others' rights. Brothers of all who desire the *Association* of the equal and free, we feel a special affection for that people which for fifty years has fought for the emancipation of the nations, and translated into the sphere of politics, the grand results of the Christian Age.

(3) It is an error to base our estimate of the work of moral freedom achieved by the Reformation upon the accident of a protest against the Dict of Spire, from which the term *protestantism* originated. Protestantism was not, as the neo-christians affirm, a negation, a work of criticism in relation to the age. It was a positive Christian product, a solemn manifestation of the *individual*—which is the *aim* of Christianity. It protested, doubtless, but only against the Papacy, which by desiring what it was unable to perform, and attempting to establish a *social* unity with an individualistic instrument, was necessarily fated to degenerate into tyranny and thus place itself outside that Christian philosophy of life, which, before it had attained its complete development, said to man, "Be free." It is not therefore a protest

*against* the philosophy of its age, but in *favour* of the philosophy which the Papacy, impotent to realise a sublime instinct of the future, destroyed instead of developing

(4) No one can reasonably charge us with ignoring the catholic spirit that presides over the destinies of modern civilisation. Everybody knows the meaning generally given to the word *catholicism*. If *catholicism* were only synonymous with *universal*, we might recall the fact that every religion by its nature tends to become *catholic*, and notably so the philosophy that writes *Humanity* at the head of its articles of faith

(5) I anticipate the objection "Success is a delusion, slavery, inequality, remain everywhere. The struggle was scarcely begun by the French Revolution. The *individual* still dominates every question, and while you talk of a new age, unanswered prayers are raised on every side imploring that the social ideal declared by you to be exhausted, may even now be attained and translated into fact."

We must not confound the discovery of an element of progress with its realisation and triumph, the *ideal* evolution of the thought of an age with its *material* application, the conquest with its practical consequences. The positive application of a given principle to the different parts of the political, economic, and civil organism cannot successfully begin except its moral development in men's minds be completed. That

development constitutes the work of an Age. Scarcely is it completed when some power—an individual or a people—proclaims its results and hands its formula to the nations. Then a new Age has already begun, in which, while men's minds are working at the newly revealed principle, the gradual completion is effected of the principle of the dead or dying Age. The thought of one Age is only realised when the mind is already fixed upon the ideal of the new Age. Were this otherwise, the chain that connects the Ages would be broken, and what is termed a lapse of continuity would take place.

Now I affirm, that if on the one hand the *material* application of the two principles, liberty and equality, that constituted the doctrine of the individual, be not effected—nor will it be effected until a people has marked the new principle as the *end* and *aim* of the common task—yet, on the other hand, their development is *morally* accomplished. I maintain that the *unknown* factor of the Middle Ages can now be placed in the category of *known* quantities, that what was hypothesis is now an axiom, that the theory has become an admitted, recognised law. Who denies liberty or equality? Who doubts the Right? The most illiberal king speaks in the name of that liberty he abhors in his heart. If we may believe him, he is protecting the liberties and rights of his subjects against the anarchy of factions. The question is decided in

the sphere of principles the only difference of opinion relates to its application. We dispute, not about the law, but about its interpretation

The *individual* is now no longer the *end* of our labours. He, even he, indeed, will be seen to be sacred when the *social* law is proclaimed, and we are bound to bring our duties and rights into harmony with it, while the worship of *individuality* has given place to an ignoble *individualism*, to egotism, to a nameless immorality

(6.) Association, say some, is no new principle. it cannot therefore, as the objective of the forces of mankind, constitute a new system or induce its necessity. Association is nothing but a method, a means for realising liberty and equality. It belongs to the old system, and we see no necessity for a new one

Association, I admit, in its more general signification, is no more than the *method of progress*, the means by which it is gradually achieved. To every step forward there corresponds a new degree of force, a new expansion of association. And in this sense, so far as we are concerned, association began with the progress that is coeval with the origin of our planet. Its work appeared in every dead philosophy, most of all in that which men wish to see dominant to-day.

Nevertheless, though association has always exercised an influence upon us, it has been without our know-



ledge Men were unconsciously under its influence. Thus it was with progress, with the law of gravitation, with all great physical and moral truths They were at work before they were revealed

But is there not a difference between an undiscovered law, and one that is proclaimed, recognised, accepted—a difference sufficient to change the starting-point of intellectual labour? The law, when defined, imposes a *duty* on us of ruling our actions in accordance with it The fulfilment of the law becomes an *end* for all our efforts, and the study of every thinker is how to derive the greatest possible results from it Minds no longer risk going astray and losing precious time in researches whose object has been already obtained Forces are increased a hundredfold by concentration they work in a determined direction Formerly the instinct of law only produced a right—and a right that was nearly always contested

The great historical ages date, not from the birth of a law, a truth, a principle, but from their promulgation Were this not so, it would be absurd to speak of distinct ages or philosophies Truth is one and eternal *thought*, the germ of the world in God, contains it all.

Equality existed in principle long before Jesus, and the world was unconsciously tending towards it Why then recognise the Christian age?

The earth did not wait for the revelations of Copernicus

or Galileo, or the formulas of Newton, to describe its orbit round the sun. Why then do we recognise the two distinct astronomical Ages of the Ptolemaic and Newtonian systems? And, coming nearer to the present day, did not the theories of the English economists, and those, too quickly forgotten, of the St Simonians, mark out two radically different periods of economic science? Yet the only difference between them is the substitution of the principle of association for that of liberty.

Now, we believe the time has arrived for the principle of *association* to be solemnly and universally proclaimed, and become the centre of all study, theoretical and practical, which aims at the progressive organisation of human societies, to shine at the head of our constitutions, our codes of law, the articles of our faith. And furthermore, I maintain that the promulgation of a principle which marks out an entirely new direction for our studies, is sufficient to constitute, or at least to indicate a new Age, if nothing more.

And, moreover, our motto is not *Association* merely. it implies the association of Europe, and by its means of Humanity in all its faculties and forces, with the necessary conditions of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. for the purpose of achieving a common *end*, namely, the discovery and progressive application of its law of life.

(7) Right is obviously a secondary idea, a deduction which forgets the principle it sprang from, a mere con-

sequence which has been inflated to an absolute, and independent doctrine. Every right exists in virtue of a law, the law of Being, the law that defines the nature of the subject treated. Where is this law? I do not know. Its discovery is the *aim* of the present Age, but the certainty of its existence is enough to make us substitute the idea of *duty* for that of *right*.

(8) The word *democracy*, although when endowed with historical precision it may express vigorously enough the ideal of a world, at least of the ancient world, is, like all the political phrases of antiquity, unequal to the conception of the future Age which we republicans are called to initiate. The expression *social government* would be preferable as indicating the conception of *association*, which is the life of the Age. The word democracy was inspired by an idea of rebellion, sacred indeed, but still rebellion. Now, every such conception is evidently imperfect and inferior to the idea of Unity which will be the doctrine of the future. There is a note of strife in the word democracy: it is the cry of Spartacus, the expression of a people in its first attempt to rise. "Social government," "Social institutions," represent a people organising itself after victory. The extinction of *aristocracy* will efface the name *democracy*.

(9) We are not expounding a doctrine but a series of bases for belief, disjointed and merely stated, but nevertheless sufficient to indicate the nature of our

religious and philosophical conceptions. Our political beliefs are only consequences more or less direct and evident. It is easy to understand how the mere fact of preaching a new age, and a new philosophy of life, separates us from all who believe themselves to be carrying on the old principle, and entrust a new development only to those nations who are guardians of the highest expression of progress yet attained to. The principle that a new system of philosophy must include all the elements of the preceding philosophies besides its own, is the formal rejection of every theory that *destroys* and does not *harmonise*, of every political school which only asks to substitute one class for another, one social element for another, of every exclusive system which, like that of Babeuf, destroys liberty for the sake of a chimerical, deceptive equality, which eliminates the most sublime moral factor, that of the *ego*, and renders all progress impossible, or which, like the *American School*, centres itself in the *individual*, solves every political problem in the sense of liberty alone, smothers the principle of association under the omnipotence of the *ego*, condemns progress to the irregularities of a fitful, intermittent movement which defies calculation, plants distrust in the civil organisation, dismembers social unity in an independent dualism of the temporal and spiritual powers, and introduces materialism, individualism, egotism, and contradiction into the minds of men through the doctrine of the

*atheism* of the law and the sovereignty of rights and interests Our conception of Humanity as the sole interpreter of the Law of God separates us from every School that divides progress into two distinct Ages, or confines it almost by force within one single defined philosophy or religion, or which imprisons the traditions of Humanity in the theory of one sole revealer, or which breaks the continuity of our labours by the theory of a constant supernatural intervention, by the theory of a series of complete dispensations without relation to each other, by a chain of social formulas all revealed, all sundered by a void between Our principle of the People, which is simply the application of the doctrine of Humanity to every nation, is the direct and sufficient cause of the principle of *universal suffrage*, which is the manifestation of the people, and of the exclusion of all authority that is not delegated by the people, or is exercised by one caste or individual The principle of association, considered as the sole method of progress, involves unlimited liberty for all associations for secondary or special objects not in conflict with the moral law The principle of moral unity, without which association is impossible, implies the duty of a general elementary *education* to expound the programme of such association to all who will be partners in it Lastly, the principle that declares the individual sacred and inviolable, carries with it not only the absolute liberty of the press, the

## Faith and the Future

abolition of the death penalty, and of every other punishment, that, instead of developing, improving, and perfecting the individual, tends to suppress and limit him, but also a whole theory of work, considered as a manifestation of the individual and the representation of his *worth*



## THE PATRIOTS AND THE CLERGY



The Essay on "The Patriots and the Clergy" is an appeal to the Liberals and the Clergy to show mutual tolerance. There had been a good deal of the ultramontane propagandism, which culminated ten years later in the Sonderbund. The liberals, on their side, had been disposed to put it down with a high hand. Mazzini believed that there were many among the Catholic clergy whose real sympathies were with reform, and he appeals to them to carry out the democratic teaching of the Gospel. The sceptical and stunted ideas of the liberals were largely responsible for their alienation. A bigger national policy and mutual forbearance would, he hoped, range many of the priests on the side of progress.

The lasting interest of the Essay lies in Mazzini's exposition of his views as to the relations of Church and State. In advocating the independence of the two, he was, as he recognised, at variance with his ideal. Brought up in a Catholic country, he had a Catholic's craving for unity of belief. Fusing as he did in his mind religion and politics, the conception of a "Free Church in a Free State" was repugnant to him. Sooner or later, he had no doubt, Church and State would be identified, and till then there could be no true social unity. But at present such an identification could only work harm. The Church taught doctrines that intelligence could not accept. The men who ruled the State were too limited in their ideals to be entrusted with spiritual authority: the future social unity lay outside their comprehension, and their only logical position was to apply the principle of liberty all round. Hence, all religious propagandism, so long as it respected the liberty of others, should be treated as a matter of opinion, and the Government must hold its hands off. Possibly, had Mazzini's advice been followed, the Civil War of the Sonderbund might have been avoided: it is probable though that the ultramontane party was too aggressive, and the question too much complicated with that of cantonal rights, to have made it possible for the Government to leave matters alone.

Incidentally the Essay touches a good deal on contemporary Swiss politics.

They had a dull outlook at the time. The different cantons were connected by the loosest of bonds, the Diet was a mere "ghost of authority," and meekly obedient to orders from Paris or Vienna. Many of the cantons were governed by narrow oligarchies, the reforming movement which had followed the French Revolution of 1830 had been checked. The Great Councils of the cantons debated with closed doors. Customs' lines checked trade, privileged guilds fettered industry, there was no common money or common standard of weights and measures, public offices were openly sold, Jesuits had been admitted into the Catholic cantons. There were three political parties: the Conservatives, anxious to preserve the old cantonal autonomy, the party of Union, aiming at a single centralised Government and the practical abolition of the canton, and the Federalists, who wished to combine a strong Federal Government with a large degree of local independence. Mazzini threw in his lot with the latter, he held unity to be the ideally best policy for Switzerland, but thought that the canton was too deeply rooted in the history of the country to be abolished. He exerted himself to persuade the Unionists to combine with the Federalists. Federalism, he thought, would lift Swiss politics into a purer air. Switzerland was in a critical condition: the absence of a strong Government had left her at the mercy of Austria and France, timidity and compromise predominated in all her political actions, the narrow cantonal life threatened to smother her in "a mud death." Publicity of deliberation, a constituent assembly to determine the question of Federalism, greater independence towards foreign powers, was his programme. Thirteen years later the constitution of 1848 realised his wishes except on the latter point, and it is worthy of note that Druey, one of the two framers of the constitution, was his personal friend.





what is its fate? Will the Anglican clergy save a decrepit aristocracy rejected by the nation? Will the Spanish monks perchance place the legitimate Don Carlos on the throne of Philip the Second? Will they restore the system under which Spain has suffered so much and fallen so low? Yet, is there another country where the influence characteristic of their organisation was more widely diffused? But yesterday men spoke of *Monkish Spain*, to-morrow, probably they will seek in vain from one end of the peninsula to the other, a single remnant of those who but a short time since were so powerful "

He who recently wrote these grave and true words is a Christian and republican priest, \* who spent half his life combating the movement towards freedom of those Peoples whom God is urging to an unknown end. One day, perhaps while reading the Gospel over again with all the faith of which a man is capable, he perceived that he had erred, he reconsidered his position, and, like a man of high intellect and pure conscience, he confessed his error. Then, after having at Rome looked his idol in the face, he returned a sad and disillusioned man, and placed himself at the head of the crusade which the men of progress in all countries have proclaimed in Christ's name for the People's cause.

We, on our side, have long felt the need of expressing something similar, to that portion of the Swiss clergy, which is reactionary at heart and takes its orders from

\* Lamennais

Rome and Vienna alike, which fights, without rest and apparently with some definite purpose, against that national progress which leads our people to new conquests of science and liberty and equality

Between the dark plots of one party and the growing irritation of the other, our feeble voice will not perhaps be listened to to-day. Our words will pass by like so many others, barren and unheeded, none the less, we are forced to utter them, if only to discharge a duty to our conscience. In the party which we are apt perhaps too much in Voltairian fashion to prejudice under the name of the *clerical party*, there are men of good faith, men who are not perverse but only misled; devout souls, whose sincerity and zeal only serve the machinations of those who libel the patriots and liberalism, who paint the former as the enemies of all religion, and insult the latter by giving it the characteristics of anarchy. To those we offer sincere words of peace and fraternity, because, although they have turned to reactionary ways, they represent in the Church what we are accustomed to respect wherever it shows itself—*faith* and religious feeling. The others, conspirators and reactionaries by system, only represent class interests and greed and lust of power. For those we only feel contempt.

We must leave on one side all that touches the present time. We attach no importance to intrigues of the moment or petty local encroachments, they were easily foreseen. The *coups d'état* that have lately taken place

in France could not fail to find a certain correspondence among us Rome, Paris, St Petersburg, Vienna, and Berlin, all form an alliance of homogeneous elements, so many links in a chain, so many fires that radiate in unison their sinister flashes, now singly, now together, and just at the present moment we see their united flare The word of command was passed round that the whole chain should move Hence there is no need to wonder at all those petty plots that are being hatched and unhatched in the night, and will perish in the night, unless they win a fictitious importance. We are bound to say that, if considered in a merely political light, the question does not seem to us worthy of serious attention, nor do the acrid polemics started on the subject by some cantonal newspapers deserve it So far as we are concerned, we recognise in politics neither clerical party, nor catholic party, nor romanist party From our point of view there are only two great parties the *progressive* and the *reactionary* They are composed of individuals of every order, of every rite, of every sect. But neither order, nor rite, nor sect should save the factious from punishment Governments have the right to control and repress any individual interest which disturbs the social order, or arbitrarily overrides or excepts itself from the public law (which is the bond and seal of association for all the inhabitants of a country), and thus revolts *de facto* against the common weal But, outside the circle within which this legiti-

mate, authority may be exercised, there is not, and cannot be, especially in the existing state of things, any rule save full and perfect liberty; liberty for every citizen and every opinion, it matters not whether they be reactionary or progressive, liberty for all actions that have naturally the sanction and support of the public law. In the present state of theories and facts, every question of religious worship and organisation, is a question of the public law and liberty. So long as the actions and pretensions of a sect, or of any religious association, do not exceed the limits of its own constitution, or do not touch the civil order of society, you have no right to interfere. The intervention of Government can only be applied at the present day to actions that directly violate existing laws. The rest belongs to the sphere of ideas, and is a question of belief. Reform belief, spread the light, meet fanatical newspapers with other newspapers. Do not thwart the work of the patriots, do not obstruct their progress with unjust suspicions, or a disgraceful and cowardly compliance with the demands of foreign courts, or an obvious disposition to stagnate in the *status quo*. Defend the free press instead of being frightened by it, and have no other fears. Allow the Pope to select at his pleasure, bishops who are foolish, and ignorant, and out of touch with the times. what can they do other than hasten the downfall of the papal power? Let the Jesuits and others of the factious make expensive journeys, hold



their conferences, write their wretched articles, their contemptible and inept pamphlets suffer them to go their ways. Persecution would only exalt them by giving them an excuse to pose as victims, it would invest them with an importance that neither their writings, nor their meetings, nor the intrigues in which they exhaust themselves, could ever win for their sect. The old Catholicism is dying let it struggle even in its death-throes. Its death-blow will come from some idea that shines with the light of truth, not from the hammer of restrictive laws. All the regulations and curbs you may invent, will not be worth one single school of thought.

Therefore, as far as the political question is concerned, we agree with the opinion expressed by Troxler at the time of the Baden Conference, an opinion supported afterwards, if our memory serves us rightly, by a daily paper that gave effective assistance to the cause of progress in Geneva, we mean the "*Europe Centrale*." There is a conception which must one day (we, at least, have no doubt) harmonise, or rather identify the two Powers of Church and State, but until this is clear and definite in the mind and conscience of the Nations, until political thought rises to the height and sacredness of a religious idea, and true social unity is established, till then ecclesiastical and political authority should be exercised freely, and, so far as possible, independently of each other on distinct <sup>as</sup> Their respective ac-

tivities must not clash, and hence they must not interfere with each other. Each has the right to associate itself with whomever it pleases, to receive inspirations from any source it likes, to pay those whom it chooses and accepts as the interpreters of its religion and the rulers of its conscience. So long as ecclesiastical bodies do not overstep the limits of the religious sphere in which they move, it is within their power to do whatever they please, and propagate their beliefs by speech or writing in the way that seems good to them. We do not fear the influence of political or religious prejudices where we are allowed a free hand and a fair field to confute them. We do fear—if for nothing else, for the example of a dangerous precedent—the intervention of Government where it is not absolutely required by the force of circumstances. We wish to concede the smallest possible amount of power to the present Governments, just because we have no faith in them. Nor do we expect from their efforts any fruit of national progress, because we suspect that, while they accentuate certain questions under the colour of religion, their only purpose is to distract public attention from national questions. In 1830 the conquest of Algeria was designed to conceal from the French—a brilliant and chivalrous people—the odious nature of the projected decrees. And now, in our case, it is perhaps not too daring to presume, that the ostentatious energy displayed against the foolish encroachments of the *ultramontane* clergy, has been

merely used to defend the want of energy in dealing with political encroachments much more pernicious. We desire to substitute for governmental influence quite another weapon. We should wish to see the activity necessary to progress transferred from that influence to a national Centre. We should like to find the breach less often filled by the Authority of the law, and more often by the men of progress, not excluding those members of the Christian priesthood who are equally inspired by the love of fatherland and liberty. The latter should place themselves as apostles of truth and light between the people, who have strayed through lack of education, and the leaders of agitations. They should apply the activity and constancy that evil-minded priests give to the cause of Satan and his powers of darkness, to the defence of Christ's heritage—that is to say, equality and the improvement of the greatest number.

With these premisses we purpose ascending to the social question, and, from the Pisgah of a religious conception and of the future destinies of the People—or rather of the Peoples—to address, with faith in our own rectitude, with our hand on our heart, the following words to the erring members of the clergy.

## II

*October 10, 1835*

In the name of Christ whither are you hastening?  
In the name of Him who walked with the People

and whom the mighty put to death, why walk you with the mighty? Why do you abandon the People's cause? Why do you stand aloof from those who hold His banner on high and seek to translate into facts the teachings of Christ?

Christ said . " Love God first, and love ye one another with brotherly affection "

And he also said " He who would be first among you let him be the servant of all "

In those words is comprehended the whole essence of Christianity. Unity of faith, mutual love, human brotherhood, activity in good works, the doctrine of self-sacrifice, the affirmation of the doctrine of equality, the abolition of all aristocracy, the perfecting of the individual, and liberty, without which neither love nor perfection can exist—all this is summed in those two precepts

If we inscribe on our banner the words *Liberty, Equality, Humanity*, we become the heralds of a Christian faith We seek the unity of belief that Christ promised for all Peoples, for all the earth We are neither Catholics nor Protestants the true doctrine of Christ has made Christians only

If we cry to the Masses " God and the People ' There is only one master in heaven, God one master on the earth, the People , the whole People associated in an active belief, fruitful in peace and love, in order to advance under the eye of God to the knowledge and

interpretation of his universal law," we take upon ourselves the office of Christ's apostles. Christ came for all, he spoke to all and for all. He did not have one teaching for some, another for others. He spoke from the Mount in the same language to all who crowded around Him. He hurled his anathema against the Scribes and Pharisees, who were the men of caste, the privileged classes of his time. Before his coming there were, in the opinion of the world, two natures of men—the nature of the master and the nature of the slave. He destroyed this fallacy. He proclaimed the unity of human nature by teaching the unity of its origin. He burst the chains of servitude. He raised up the People, and died for it.

And if we follow out his teachings to their consequences, if we try to apply them to civil society, if we protest with all our might against every oppression, every inequality, every violation of his Holy Word, we incarnate in our very selves the moral teaching of Christ. We are labouring for his faith, for the salvation and organisation of the Church of Humanity, which is the *congregation of the believers in that faith*. Since man was made in the image of God, we are labouring that human society may be fashioned, so far as possible, in the image of the divine society, of that celestial country where all are equal, where the same love and the same happiness exist for all. We seek to learn the ways of God upon the earth, because we know that this earth

was given to us as the workshop of our labour, because only by fulfilling his task upon it, does man become worthy to ascend to heaven, because we know we are to be judged by our works in this world, by the help we have given to the poor, by the consolation we have shown to the afflicted. We may not lock ourselves up in barren and selfish prayer for our own souls, while the cry of the poor and oppressed smites our ears, nor turn away our faces from our neighbour, and be content with our own spiritual progress, while all around us is falling to wreck, while the country that God has given us is in danger of a dishonourable death from the despotic influence of the foreigner, and the germs of anarchy that vitiate its institutions, while those who should be first to expel the evils that threaten us, allow themselves to drift on in fatuous security, and prostitute the house of God to foreign insolence and that base trickery that goes by the name of *diplomacy*. The law of God has not two measures. It is *one* law for heaven as for earth. We cannot wish that our immortal spirit should deny on earth the gift of liberty, which is the source of Good and Evil in human actions, and whose exercise constitutes in the eyes of God the virtuous and the wicked man. We cannot wish that the brow that was made to lift itself to heaven should bend in the dust before any man, whoever he may be, nor suffer that soul which aspires to eternal Truth to grovel in the mire, ignorant of its rights, its power, and its noble origin. We cannot call ourselves

Christians, and permit men, instead of *loving one another like brothers*, to be selfish, hostile, divided, city from city, canton from canton, nation from nation. We therefore preach Association as the means of general perfectibility, liberty, equality, human dignity, enfranchisement from all servitude, the progress of all institutions, the sacredness of every land from the invader, the honour and well-being of every People, an alliance of all nations, the destruction by free speech of all prejudices. We preach the doctrine of the *Fatherland*, the abode and temple of our race, the doctrine of *Humanity* that Christ announced, the ambit and bond of fellowship of all countries, who shall be free and independent, but sisters in one faith, one love, one Gospel. And when we preach these things, we are ready, if needs be, to seal them with our blood, to die as Christ died for their realisation, and the salvation of all men.

Now, these ideas germinated at the foot of the cross of Christ—of the Christ you serve. For eighteen hundred years they have been permeating the world, now under one, now under another form, to-day they are applied to politics, a short time since to the movement of the intellect. Their virtue destroyed feudalism, abolished in nearly every country the aristocracy of blood, and is about to deal it the last blow in feudal England. The princes of Europe leagued themselves against these ideas, the forces of all the privileged classes were often gathered to oppose them, but in the

end every one of their attempts failed. Those ideas seemed to fall vanquished, you would have said they were banished for ever from the world, yet they reappeared. They were drowned in blood, and they reappeared. In one age they were condemned to the fires of the Inquisition, in another to the gallows of kings, and they reappeared more potent, more ubiquitous, more threatening than ever. They invaded the armies assembled to destroy them, the tribunals called to condemn them, and even the remnants of those very aristocracies that had been wounded to death by them. They marched to a national crusade in Poland under the banner of the mother of Christ. In the name of the cross of Christ they gave back Greece to Europe. They move the world, advancing between victory and martyrdom. And do you call movements like these the work of a sect? In this potency of new life that is agitating the whole of society, can you see nothing but the underground work of a few conspirators? In this ever-increasing sound of Peoples rising in their might, of multitudes who desire to found a better future, of oppressed races that demand their place in the light of the sun, do you see nothing but the effect of an obscure word thrown at a venture to the crowd, by a few factious men?

Men of the clergy, clear your minds of cant! There is in this an influence more serious and potent than



the vain conceit of a writer, or some rebels' plot. The stake is the whole destiny of the civilised world, ordered and impressed by the finger of God on the heart of the generations. It sweeps you also along with it in its advance. It involves a law of continual progress of which we are the conscious or unconscious agents, and without which there would be neither life, nor progress, nor religion. If you oppose it, you are fighting against Christ, against God, and against Humanity—God's interpreter on earth.

Now, do you realise the effect of this impotent strife of yours? Do you see the fruit of your exertions among the Peoples whom you wish to fetter?

It is the fruit of scepticism, of doubt, of negation. It is the fruit of anarchy in belief, and all the immorality that has its roots therein. Its offspring are violent reactions, excesses of civil anger, the fires of Bristol, or of the Spanish convents. It dissociates religion from the great humanitarian movement. It dishonours the priest and the altar. It destroys the temple. It has ruined the people, and will ruin, if you persevere long in your reactionary path, the Christian faith and its future.

### III

*October 14, 1855*

We addressed a few words to the authorities to this effect—Interfere as little as possible in religious

questions. Allow them to develop freely in the field of ideas, do not be frightened by a few impotent, secret agitators, who have no definite purpose, and are condemned to fall of themselves into oblivion. Do not be irritated by the vagaries of the factious Catholic press, because the universal contempt will set them at their value. The future *unity* of the human family—*social unity*—is beyond your comprehension, belonging as you all do, body and soul, to the old school and the old age. Your sole principle is *liberty*, nothing more. At least be consistent, and desire liberty in all things, liberty for all, for religious society as for political society. Watch over and punish acts that directly touch public order, the liberty and safety of the citizens. Punish them from whatever quarter they proceed, but do not claim attributes outside your functions, or make yourselves dictators in matters that do not concern you. Be not over-zealous to *prevent*, since that is not your province. The public law is sufficient to *repress*.

And we said to the factious priests, to the priests who sell Christ a second time to the aristocracy and the Princes of the earth—Beware! You are few in number, and fallen from your high estate, fallen because of the countless faults of your leaders, because they have deserted the People's cause for that of their masters, the cause of the poor for that of the idle rich. You are fallen, because you have wedded

indifferent They ignore the great services that strong beliefs have rendered to the cause of Humanity They ignore how much there is that is noble and sublime and potent in faith in a great religious principle They forget that religion is immortal, that it is born with the world, and "will endure as long as the world shall endure,"\*—and that materialistic theories lead directly to the principle of individual interest, and hence to egotism and all its attendant evils

Yet, above all these petty contests of diocesan elections, of examinations, of jurisdiction, there exists something immeasurably greater, holier, more vital for the Church, and conscience, and faith Above all the ecclesiastical diatribes, the futile demands of the particular absurdities of which the so-called religious question is composed, there is something whose essence is independent from, and alien to, all these squabbles, something immeasurably more important for our future, for our social condition, for the growth of our Country

We mean THE RELIGIOUS SENTIMENT

The religious sentiment is the divine fount of all religions, of all beliefs that have God for their beginning and Humanity for their end, and which are animated by the *spirit*, without which every belief is passive and barren, every religion no more than a sect, every faith but a tradition, a habit, an outward profession

\* "Durerà quanto il mondo lontana"—*Dante, Inf.*, II 60

It is the religious sentiment which hallows the thoughts and actions of Man, that ennobles the human creature in his own eyes, and gives him the consciousness of a mission to fulfil. It gives him the sense that God has not cast him at a venture upon this earth of trial, but that his existence is a function of universal life and harmony, a link in the great chain of beings, a necessary point in the line that connects Man with God and our earth with His universe. It is that which makes all his life a scene of self-sacrifice and charity.

The religious sentiment is brotherhood, and association, and love. From it flow strength and constancy in the struggle for these great principles, indifference to danger, noble resignation in persecution and misfortune.

Such is the religious sentiment, by means of which alone you can advance along the path of progress; for materialism—be assured—however you may desire to consider it, will verily give nothing but the consciousness of your own individuality, the certainty of a few Rights, the power to use them or not at will, or the habit of seeking your own material success even at the cost of your brother's weal, wherever society does not rebel and allow it with impunity. But you will never draw from materialism, either capacity for progress, or the virtue of self-sacrifice and martyrdom.

Now, this religious sentiment is the foundation and bond of all social fellowship, the only pledge of security for the continuous and pacific progress of every

people that desires to be a nation, since it unites the souls of men in one purpose, and refers to a *superior law* what rival theories make the result of *chance* and the moment's ebb and flow, thus placing under God's own tutelage the Rights, and happiness, and independence, and improvement of the Peoples. How is it then, we ask, that this religious sentiment is wrecked, and whither will it sink?

Where sink all good and great sentiments of the human soul, when it has no guide save a narrow, contentious, ambitious conception, where all religions sink when they forget the principle of love and brotherhood that launched them on their way, where all societies sink when they substitute mere opposition, for zeal in good works, mistrust for unity, interests for duty. The religious sentiment is declining day by day, is perishing amid petty contests, amid the irritation born of barren party strife, under the evil influence of an odious and reactionary policy. Wherefore some among you—who are prone to confound ideas with those who bring them into disrepute, and institutions with those who profess to represent them—speak evil of religion because it is administered by false priests, of sacred things because they are profaned by men, of beliefs because the blind and ambitious have falsely interpreted them. Others, conversely, deny progress because it was in some degree misunderstood, and condemn the patriots because they sometimes met in their ranks rogues and hypocrites.

They deny holy Liberty, Equality, the People, Association, Humanity, because the long series of sacred and high-principled struggles was interrupted by the sad days of '93, when the People of France, goaded to excess, attacked by all monarchical Europe on one side, and domestic conspiracy on the other, swept along in a terrible and unprecedented flood of reaction and vengeance, that will never be repeated, because the circumstances that produced it can never be repeated anywhere.

This is our position to-day, and when perchance from one or the other of the two parties, someone comes forth to join us, seeking to free Truth from the bands of discord that swaddle it, we distrust him as a hypocrite with some secret, ulterior purpose, and we brand his quiet, honest conduct as mere strategy.

This is the attitude of the clergy towards the patriots, and this, too often, is the attitude of the patriots towards a part of the clergy, who perhaps need only to understand and believe in us in order to join our ranks.

Now, if the clergy were to rally to us, or rather to the holy belief that we preach concerning the words of Christ, would the scepticism they deplore be so general and hostile? If they ceased to struggle against the light of intelligence, and the movement that springs from it, would they be defeated and routed by it, and should we be divided from them? We fight against scepticism equally with them, and if we are not allowed a speedy conquest, the fault is theirs, who make Christ's law and

God's progress, the monopoly of a caste, who rob the masses of their heritage of common rights, and their fair share of the blessings that God has given to his creatures. The clergy have the destinies of the Church in their own hands they will wreck it where they persist in the narrow and reactionary path that they have followed so long.

And if the patriots, the men of progress, would not, from excess of irritation, confound faith with its ministers, religion with the priest, if they were not too disposed to exceed the bounds of moderation in the great movement that urges us on, if they did not believe it their duty, through some feeling of mistaken dignity, to free themselves at the same time from the religious principles which alone can prepare the future, if they did not forget so often how our fathers, when preparing themselves for the battles of liberty, knelt before God, how they rose up stronger after prayer, and conquered in the fight, while we, though so proud and presumptuous before God, drag the national flag in the mud and let our country cringe to an ambassador, if the patriots acted otherwise, think you that all the clergy would oppose us? Think you not that honest and devoted men, who have erred in good faith, would part themselves from the majority, often greedy and radically immoral, and join us? And would you fear the predominance of what is called the *clerical party* anywhere, where the people found in you religion, the true religion, that shows itself

in good works; that loves and consoles, and consecrates itself to the brethren?

## IV

October 17th, 1835

Rise to principles—to universals Do not scorn truth because men have obscured it Strive rather to free it from the errors which envelop it, and the prejudices which corrupt it Do not dash to pieces what has always been the instrument of great deeds because some fanatic has misconceived its omnipotent action We are on the threshold of a great Age, the *Age of the Peoples* Learn to understand the vast, sublime, religious meaning of these words Rise to the height of your mission as men and citizens The co-operation of all can alone achieve the work of all Seek such co-operation in all possible ways with that sincerity of soul that wills the good There must be no revenge, no premeditated hostility, no blind invectives against a whole order of persons All general invectives are unjust Grieve for those who stray from the right path, but do not persecute them Do not embitter your resentment with useless recrimination The past is nothing Open your minds to our words we begin a new work Let the angel of peace and concord spread his wings over your young flag, and let the spirit of love proceed, not only from your lips, but from your hearts Trust in God, in



the goodness of your cause, and in the power of Truth  
Be faithful, and you will conquer

To the priests we say Do not forget that all great revolutions are fulfilled by virtue of a law ordained of God to guide the motion of human affairs, and recognise that what is seething around you to day is a great revolution, not a mere revolt Its development is at work in the hearts of every People In spite of every obstacle, it has been gaining ground for the last fifty years, and everything militates in its favour—its persistent and cosmopolitan character, its audacity, its eloquence, its self-sacrifice, its martyr's crown To stand apart and fight against it is to fight against God's will, and to part oneself from Humanity, the interpreter and executor of His commands, it is to stand aside from God and the movement of Humanity, it is self-destruction Remember that every *social* revolution must be either *with* you or *against* you, and that if you ally religion to resistance you wreck religion without profiting your cause Remember that the Church—THE CONGREGATION OF THE FAITHFUL—when it is not an instrument of progress becomes a corpse, that it was instituted to hallow, to harmonise, to unite, not to impede and divide the elements of life given by God to man, that your mission is to bless and not to curse Remember that Christ himself announced the NEW AGE, in which the *spirit* would come and reveal to us in *pure truth* what

## The Patriots and the Clergy

He could only signify to us in parables\*, and that, according to St Paul, we are destined here below, not to organise a *stationary City*, but to seek and to attain to the *holy City of progress and of the future*†

And to the patriots we say. Remember that our doctrine is the doctrine of liberty and association, that we fight for all, that our office is to unite and not to divide; that it is our duty to attack intolerance in whatever place and form it shows itself, and not to substitute a new intolerance for the old one. Remember that it is not given to you to found your authority, save upon a general, immutable, eternal principle; that this principle is *the Law of Progress*; that every law has its legislator, and that if you forget this you wander in the void, you lose your rallying point, and leave your doctrines and their triumph to chance. Remember that religion is a want, a necessity of the Peoples, that all changes of form that have been in the world have never succeeded in extinguishing the religious sentiment, and that if you neglect this element of human nature, you condemn yourself to a task that cannot be completed because it has no organic vitality, you divide man and the world

\* "The Spirit of Truth . . . the Comforter . . . no more in proverbs but plainly . . . will teach you all the Truth"—John xiv 16, 17, 26, 30; xv 26, xvi 7, 13, 25

† "For here we have no *abiding* city, but we seek after the city *which is to come*"—Epistle to the Hebrews xiii 14

into two parts, you rob your labour of a fruitful source of activity, you deny that moral unity which is the end and aim of every great revolution, and the necessary condition of its permanency. And remember that every *social* revolution is essentially *religious*, that every Age has its *belief*, that without unity of faith Association is impossible, that to preach Humanity, Fatherland, the People—those great formulas of Association which dominate our Age from on high—while you deny or neglect the *religious sentiment*, is to misconceive the significance of those words, to will the end without the means, the work without the necessary instruments.

These are our beliefs, and they give our rule of action. We ask those who have been educated in the habit of mistrust, which is only too certainly the fruit of party passion, and who might doubt a single instant our full and entire good faith, to watch carefully our acts and words, and where they find us in one single instance in contradiction with ourselves, let them point it out. From that day forth we will be silent.

We patriots, we men of a new Age, whose souls look for a religious future for all Humanity, we are bound to lift its banner boldly on high. We cherish in our hearts the vision of a *faith*—not of a *school*—of progress and successive improvement for the Peoples, and in particular for our Country, which the Peoples will salute and acknowledge as the land which has kept in trust for

them the germ of republicanism, we cherish the vision of a thorough and sincere agreement among all who believe in Country and Humanity, the vision of a union of all societies in one great association, strong by its activity, by its devotion, by its conscious rectitude and one sacred belief for all—societies that to-day have no flag, no principles, and therefore die of stagnation almost before they are born, and never fulfil their national mission, the vision of a periodical Press animated by brotherly sympathies, pressing to the same battles under the same flag, intent to achieve its task without bitterness, and spite, and jealousy, intent to gather to itself the great Voice of the Nation, intent to fulfil one and the same mission, because it is convinced that national progress advances more rapidly, when a People realises and incarnates *one single principle*, than when it wages a losing fight for a thousand petty details that even in the mass would give no result, precisely because they do not centre round one great constructive principle, set as the keystone of the nation's structure. We cherish the hope that patriots will arise, with deep convictions and vast ideas, spurred onwards, not by threats of aristocratic restorations, nor rumours of foreign wars, but because it is a duty to advance along the road which our country's welfare marks out, because it is the office of a virtuous man to contribute to the happiness of his fellows and the perfecting of the nation's institutions, and because the man who has *a faith* is bound to witness to it every

hour of the day We look forward to a generation of Swiss who will feel that they are free by their fathers' heritage and by their own right, who will hold their heads high alike before enemies and friends, who with a free and fearless soul will do what their own well-being demands and conscience bids, who will not bow their national pride before any man, who will put their trust only in God, and in their own powers, and in the might of the fraternity of nations—a true fraternity, not of vain words,—an unresting activity,—a republican morality,—a sincere faith, free from hypocrisy, and intolerance, and prejudice

And why should we exclude Christ's priests from this movement of general consecration that we have foreseen, in which, by virtue of its own intrinsic nature and its goal, all classes, all orders, all sections of religious belief, all men of good faith, will be gathered together? Or rather, why should not the priest of Christ take his place there of right because of his faith? And why should not his blessing descend on the banner of the new crusade, on the ardent souls of the young, in whom lies the future of our Country?

We know that many will remain cold and impassible to these words, these hopes, the enthusiasm that dictates this language The *reactionary patriots* will smile with an air of scorn, men whose hearts are perverted or sealed by materialistic philosophy, will shrug their shoulders Let them go their ways But we know, too,

that among those priests of Christ who stand aloof because of false opinions concerning us, among men whose hearts are sound, but who are mere tools and counters in the hands of an immoral Power for ever incapable of inspiring a faith that it has lost, there will perchance be found some few who, when they hear these words that come from our conscience and our heart, will be moved to reflect upon the part they are made to play, and the true import of the jesuitical schemes in which they have tried to entangle them, to feel that faith, true faith, is elsewhere, *that where the spirit of God is, there is liberty\**, and that we, the friends of liberty, are men who are true to God

And we are comforted by the thought, that among our readers, in some corner of our Switzerland, in the recesses of our mountains, or maybe on some shore of our blue and tranquil lakes, will be found perchance the white and virgin soul of some virtuous youth that will draw its inspiration from our faith, some mother who loves in all holiness, and who will receive our words, and gently whisper them in her children's ears

And this is enough to recompense our labours

\* St Paul



## TO THE ITALIANS.

*The Programme of the "Roma del Popolo" \* (1871)*

THE first number of our publication appears on the ninth of February. It bears in front the title LA ROMA DEL POPOLO, at foot, the names of men who, whatever may be their intellectual worth, have never, despite delusions and baits of worldly success, despite suffering, exile, imprisonment, denied the ideal of their hearts. It should not, therefore, be necessary to lay a programme before our readers. Everybody knows who we are. Our programme, the Republican Unity of Italy, dates back more than a third of a century. We have been silent concerning it at times when the people had strayed in opposite directions, and it needed experience and disillusion to confirm its truth, we have never abdicated it. And to-day, more than ever convinced by the experience of the last ten years, we raise again in Rome the flag we planted there forty years ago. Our publication is the cry of the Italian conscience, to uphold that formula of the national life which historical tradition and the instincts of our people have pointed out, to condemn all that spirit of

\* Rome of the People



conventionality or falsehood that betrays it with a kiss, or deliberately denies it

The ninth of February recalls a period, short but splendid in glory and promise, when, in the face of a policy of egotism and fear that obtained through Europe, and while the monarchy was betraying the honour and future of Italy on the fields of Lombardy, at Milan and Novara, Rome lifted her head in solemn protest from the grave, and sealed her protest with the blood of her noblest sons, when she showed by the concord of her citizens of every order, what time she drove the papacy to dishonoured flight, and met four hostile nations in manly fight, how much virtue of love and endurance the ancient republican faith could one day rouse in Italian hearts. A long probation in the school of political jesuitism, and servile patience, has worked since then to extinguish the memory of those days in shameful oblivion. But in Rome great memories have ever been the germs of new life, and if Romans have not changed their nature, the memories of 1849 will flower again more quickly and more effectively than some imagine. Do you not see how the monarchy, that was impelled to Rome by our agitation, by talk of the *République* at Paris, how it shrank tremulously in apprehension from the need of planting itself there permanently, how it strove for a delay of months, as if it trembled at these memories, and the shades of the great deeds that left them to your city as a sacred legacy, till it finally

The title that we have chosen, betokens the mission of Rome in the world, and the historical evolution that calls upon her to spread for the third time among the nations, a gospel of civilisation, a gospel of that moral unity which has vanished for the present in the slow death-agony of the ancient faith "This Unity all pray for—I wrote as long ago as 1844—can come, Italians, whatever men may do, from your country alone, and you can only write it on the flag, which is destined to shine on high above those two millary columns, that mark the course of thirty centuries and more in the world's life—the Capitol and the Vatican ROME OF THE CÆSARS, gave the Unity of civilisation that force imposed on Europe ROME OF THE POPES, gave a Unity of civilisation that Authority imposed on a great part of the human race. ROME OF THE PEOPLE will give, when you Italians are nobler than you are now, a Unity of civilisation accepted by the free consent of the nations for Humanity" And this faith, that sustained our life through bitterest trials, is still ours The materialists who misgovern us, see in Rome no more than a fraction of Italian earth, peopled by a certain number of inhabitants capable of paying taxes and furnishing armed levies we look on Rome as the sanctuary of the Nation, the Sacred City of Italy, the Historic Centre, whence by providential mission came Italy's message to Men, the message that makes for unity, and our *initiative* in the world A few months ago they doubted the necessity of having Rome as a metro-

polis, and published in their newspapers the foolish and wicked phrase, that *Rome belonged to the Romans*. To us, Rome did, and does belong, to Italy, as Italy to Rome. Country and metropolis form, like human organism and brain, a whole, an indivisible unity. From Rome must come, must permeate Humanity, that message that the common thought of all Italy has shaped, the message that two earlier worlds have baptised and consecrated. Without a common faith, without conception of an *ideal* that shall bind the nations together, and show to each its special function for the common good, without unity of standard for its whole moral, political, economic life, the world to-day is at the mercy of caprice, of dynastic and popular ambition and egotism. The *initiative*, which France has lost since 1815 lives no longer, visible and accepted, in any people. England deliberately abdicated it when she introduced, under the name of *non-intervention*, a policy of local *interests*. Germany threatens to sterilise all her vast power of *thought*, by surrendering the *action* that should be collective, and the formation of her unity, to a military monarchy hostile to liberty. The Slave populations, who have so great a part in the future reserved for them, dismembered and without centre of national life, still hesitate between the rule of a Czar fatal to them all, and the old difficulty of local antagonisms. And, faced by such a void, we—who are ready to hail and applaud the *initiative* wherever it may arise—we cherish as the

ideal of our heart, the sacred hope that it may arise on the ruins of the Papacy and of every similar lie, from the third Rome, from the **ROME OF THE PEOPLE**. Re-born at the cradle of an Age, Italy and Rome are called to inaugurate it, if only they know their destinies, and the moral force they have behind them

Unity at home, and a new development of civilisation abroad—these two terms include the whole programme of our publication

But all great questions resolve themselves into a question of *method*, the question, how can they pass from the sphere of *ideas* into the sphere of *facts*. Can we hope to conquer, and translate into action, the two-fold end I have spoken of, with the institutions by which we are governed? Is the instrument that we can use to-day equal to our purpose?

Deliberately, but resolutely, and with firm conviction, we answer *No!*

We will not spin again the long and painful story whose pages are marked with the names of Villafranca, Nice, Venice begged as an alms from the foreigner, Aspromonte, Mentona, Custoza, Lissa. Fatal and pregnant with inevitable consequences as these pages are, Prussia teaches us how even a monarchy might, if it so willed, escape them and fight alone, and, trusting to the national energy, win its own battles. We will not mention in condemnation of the monarchy, the financial ruin passed on from ministry to ministry,

aggravated by an economy of petty expedients, met ineffectively by immoral taxes that are a source of inequality and misery to the present generation, or by onerous loans that alienate and dry up future sources of wealth Sully, Colbert, Turgot, and others honest and capable as they, were the ministers of monarchies, and, though men like them were few and far between, and they were nearly all made powerless for good by a crowd of courtiers that always dog the throne, they nevertheless afford us glimpses of a possible selection of men better than the feeble blunderers of to-day We will not found a theoretical attack, on the habits of corruption now prevalent in high places, on the subjection of the law to the perennial caprice of individual administrators, on the continual violation of the liberty of the Press and the right of Association, on the absolute contempt for public opinion, on the hundred infringements of its *duty* by every Department, which are brought to light month by month and reported by every organ of the independent daily press Some might point to us, as a distant hope, the example of the English monarchy, tolerant of every liberty, abhorrent of absolute rule, and following, though at a distance and imperfectly, the movement of public opinion And though the conditions of life in England are, as we shall point out in this and subsequent numbers, radically different from our own, though it may seem strange and in-

decorous, that a people who have a better path before them, should be content with the vain hope that its rulers may, some day, choose this one example out of all others to follow, still, we will respect even that one example, and be silent concerning crimes and vices that others might think are confined to a single period. Our attack on the ruling form of government has a higher source

When a people has in the course of centuries defined its own mission, and revealed, conquered, incarnated in itself the *principle* that forms the essence of its life, if it is ruled by the form of Government that has presided over the long historical development of this *principle*, then that people has a vista of *reforms* before it, which multiply the practical applications of this vital *principle*, or slowly eliminate the defects inseparable from every system of social polity. Such form of Government can, on condition that it preserve intact liberty of *thought* and of the *individual*, continue to direct, if only in appearance, that slow movement of secondary manifestations. But when the necessity of things, and of the times, demands the manifestation of a new principle; when it is a question of defining a new mission, which, with its new or regenerated people devotes itself to the European task, when everything points to the revelation of a new conception of *national* or *international* life, then there inevitably begins a period of *revolution*. *Reforms* inspired by

theories of the past become dangerous. The form of Government that ruled and represented, well or ill, the old form of life and the formulas of the old doomed system, is incapable to direct the sudden, spontaneous movement, and becomes an obstacle to the attainment of the *ideal*. No form of Government has represented, or can represent in the world, *two* different principles. New things, new forms of Government, new forms of Government, new men.

The Europe of to-day is, on the whole, we believe, in this second stage, seeking, like the Israelites in the desert, a promised land still unknown,—seeking a new *principle*, a new order of things, since the old one is exhausted. He who watches Europe under the light of the great historical tradition, at once recurs to the memory of those times that eighteen centuries ago, announced the slow breaking up of Paganism, and the inevitable rise of Christianity. The absence of an *initiative* of any general and harmonious civilisation in the world, the moral anarchy that is its consequence—the wars promoted by the interests of dynasties or some few individuals—the neutrality founded on the indifference of egotism—the treaties of peace based on foolish theories of an *equilibrium* which is impossible so long as it takes into count material facts only—the question of nationality, which to day is dominant over all others, and, as eighteen centuries ago, points to a new European birth—the emancipation of the working classes which has

become, as in those times was the emancipation of the *slave*, the universal subject of a powerful agitation—the awakening of the Slave races, as in those days of the Teutonic races, to a life that now is assured them—the materialism—the exaggerated rejection of old beliefs—the aspirations after new beliefs dawning everywhere—the insensate attempts at an impossible reconciliation between the old and the new—everything points to the near advent of an order of things, founded on *principles* radically different from those that preceded the development of the present Age that now is visibly exhausted. A new conception of Life, and of the divine Law that governs it, throbs in every manifestation of the two faculties of *thought* and *action*, that make up the unity of human nature. Monarchy can neither strangle it nor make it its handmaid.

Monarchy had its day and mission. It came to fight and destroy *feudalism*, which was a system of territorial dismemberment, that hindered all possibility of unity in countries destined to form *nations*. Fronted by a *principle* of privilege based on mere force and conquest, the *king*, himself head of the feudal aristocracy, came to wear out and suppress its power, in the name of another *principle* of privilege, analogous to the first, but founded on divine authority, and consecrated by the then recognised interpreter of a living faith. This mission is the *justification* of Monarchy in history.

To-day, the *feudal* organisation has disappeared for



ever, and with it the function that gave life to the monarchical idea. A new conception, based on the Divine Law of PROGRESS, takes the place of the conception that was based on the doctrines of the Fall and the *Atonement*, and hence perishes the Papacy, the authority that ordained the *monarch* for his function.

The world is seeking, not the *material* solidarity which is now assured, and which is only the outward form of the nations, but the vivifying spirit that shall guide their life towards its end, the *moral* unity that can only be based on the *association* of men and nations equal and free. Monarchy, based upon the doctrine of inequality, on the *privilege* of an individual or of a family, can never give that unity. The flag that leads towards that destined future means PROGRESS, and dynastic interests mean *stagnation*. Now that its *end* is reached and its doctrine rejected, the monarchy, like the Papacy, lacks sonic foundation and potency of life. Throughout Europe monarchy either *follows* or *resists* the impulse that comes from elsewhere: nowhere it *initiates* or leads. Constitutional compromise, concessions that contain within themselves their own condemnation, attempt an impossible equilibrium between two powers *de facto*, that lean on the past, and a third power *de jure*, that moves with irresistible and swifter step towards its future. This can only end in the rejection of *progress*, and the necessity of violent and periodical revolutions.

We shall often have to speak of this condition of things in Europe. But if we look at Italy, our position becomes clearer, and is much strengthened by the history of the past and present.

Monarchy has no traditions in Italy. It has never been a source of national life. The captains who, strong by means of corruption and mercenary pretorian troops, degraded ancient Roman Italy from the glories and titanic energy of the Republic to the Empire, only hastened the work of dissolution that had already set in, extinguished all power of conception and will, and opened the way to the invaders of the North. In the second life of Italy and Rome, Monarchy had no mission, not even that which we mentioned as fulfilled by it in every other country. *Feudalism* was destroyed by our republican Communes. When, after a long period that gave the world a new civilisation, our slow death-agony began, under the solvent agency of the Papacy, amidst the materialism that swept over us, the civil wars, and the abuse of riches and power, then principalities arose under the auspices of successful *condottieri*, men whom the factious imprudently took as their leaders, or the nephews or bastards of ambitious Popes, all of them supported by the foreigner, who wished to divide us that he might tyrannise over us, all vassals of France, or Austria, or Spain, sometimes servants of all three in turn. The sad pages of the history of our princes, have no virtue or greatness to recall.

They naturally sought aggrandisement at the expense of their neighbouring rivals, more by intrigue or matrimonial and mercenary alliances than by open war. Not one was thrilled by a great Italian ideal, a vast ambition of a Nation founded by its own strength. Monarchy neither did, nor attempted, anything for the Unity or Liberty of the Country. It lived inglorious, satisfied to exist even at the cost of dishonour, a persecutor of thought in the domain of religious and political belief, a corrupting influence in the field of Letters. When France arose to epitomise an age, to solemnly proclaim the *Rights* of the *individual*, our princes at first threatened, without prowess to perform, then fled. When they returned, not by their own efforts, but through the arms of others, they punished the peoples for having witnessed their flight. In Turin, Modena, Naples, Rome, every aspiration after a free Country and national unity, even when offered as a new jewel for their crown, was inexorably proscribed, stifled in blood by the bullet and the gallows. Journalists may be bought, records suppressed or kept closed to investigation, men may be cowards and forget their mission and their power, but that page of history can never be blotted out. Italy has no debt of gratitude, or ought else, to Princes.

One day, three-and-twenty years ago, the *idea*, triumphant as ever over every persecution, rose, with potency of life and holy daring, from the grave where the princes thought to have buried it for ever. The

people of Italy, in their own name, and without the intervention of regular troops, won battles of giants. They might, they should have gathered for themselves the fruits of their own victories, but, intoxicated by their independence of the foreigner, and only half-awake to the consciousness of liberty, they brought them to the feet of the Monarchy. Then was the time, had the Monarchy possessed a single spark of Genius or Love, to transform itself, receive the nation's baptism, and initiate itself to destinies till then ignored or betrayed. The Monarchy did not rise to the occasion. It entered the lists, late, hesitating, reluctant. It was, by its own confession, decided solely by the fear of republican movements. It could not fight, it would not conquer, it feared the deluded and applauding people more than the enemy, and embraced the opportunity of the first reverse to descend to dishonourable treaties and withdraw from the war. Then Venice and Rome alone, unable to do more, saved, under the republican flag, the honour of the nation and its hopes for the future.

Ten years later, when passions again were hot, and destinies were ripe, the only statesman of the Italian Monarchy, a man without creative genius, but endowed with the ability to use others' talents, saw that it was necessary to advance or perish. He drove the monarchy along paths it loved not, lest others should seize upon them. And, nevertheless, even he was unable to over-

come the fatal destiny of the monarchical idea he served. Unwilling to avail himself of the popular forces of Italy, and anxious to secure an ally against them in the future, he cringed, and bought with shameful compacts an alliance with the despot who had slaughtered Rome at the feet of the Pope. He condemned the national flag to be subject to the beck and call, the errors, the crooked schemings of Imperial France. Though Garibaldi proved soon afterwards that he could win unaided what our ally had so suddenly abandoned, the Monarchy accepted as the ally's gracious gift, those fields of Lombardy that our people and our army had dyed with their own blood, and then stopped half way to move no farther unless constrained. Men, who to serve the royalist party, look at the consequences, not the causes of facts, may say to-day what they please, but History and the Italian conscience will one day say, that the popular element desired unity when the Monarchy was dreaming of royalist alliances with Bourbon, Pope, and Austria,—that the scheme, which the royalist intriguers favoured, of a Buonapartist kingdom in the centre of Italy was defeated by the efforts of us all, by the popular plebiscites,—that the emancipation of the South of Italy was won by volunteers and the populace,—that the invasion of the provinces subject to the Pope was an inevitable necessity created by the preparations for our powerful expeditions from Tuscany and Genoa, and by the clear intentions of Garibaldi,—

that Venetia was another's gift,—that, but for the terror excited by the bands of Calabria and of the Centre, by the risings at Piacenza and Pavia, by the movements which were feared at other places, and by the sudden inauguration of the Republic at Paris, the Monarchy would not be in Rome to-day. No, we repeat, Italy has no debt of gratitude, or aught else, to Princes

A Government—and it is singular that we who are christened *utopians* must remind the “practical” men of this—is not an organisation that is invented or established *a priori*, copied from England or some other country, and arbitrarily thrust upon a nation without relation to its traditions, its inherent tendencies, its common beliefs, in a word, its *collective* conscience. A Government, to be legitimate and effective, must grow out of the whole of these conditions, as a branch, or rather as the fruit, grows from a tree

The form of government must, if it is not to be injurious or useless, represent the sum-total of the integral elements of the country, must represent the *thought* that is its soul, the consciousness of the *ideal* to which the millions of men who are grouped within its natural boundaries strive instinctively. The function of government, is to purify that thought from every foreign element, to show the method best calculated to reach the *ideal*, and initiate the progressive stages that lead to it. On these conditions—but on these conditions only—we are the friends of government, and part from the theories

of reaction and systematic *mistrust*, that, at the present day, dominate a great part of our camp. Those theories are the natural fruit of the wretched Governments that nearly everywhere rest on caste, or family interests in opposition to the interests of the people, they are legitimate arms of defence against recurring dangers. But, if they became a doctrine applicable to every set of circumstances in the future, they would falsify every conception of government, and the antagonism they would create between government and governed, would be a source of never-ending war, destructive of all progress.

In the ideal that Europe is seeking, and will realise, the Government will be the *mind* of a Nation, the people its *arm*, and the educated and free individual its prophet of *future progress*. The first will point out the path that leads to the *ideal*, which at present is the only thing that makes a Nation. The second will direct the forces of the country towards it. The third will protest, in the name of a new and further ideal, against intolerance, and every tendency to deny the possibility of unlimited progress.\*

Meanwhile the Monarchy, a stranger to the National *idea*, without historical antecedents, without roots con-

\* Almost every line of this essay would require an expansion that cannot be given here, but the reader will understand that this is, a programme on which the successive numbers of the publication will be a commentary.





doctrines of ancient treaties. It allied Italy with despotic Governments, with all the compromises that try to maintain the impossible *status quo*. In the dualism between us and the Papacy, from which, with the latter's fall, our religious mission in the world was to be initiated, it only saw the means of acquiring a patch of territory, and narrowed the solution of an immense and fateful problem, to a bastard compromise between soul and body, between the moral and material, between Truth and Falsehood. To develop and direct the Italian conception of Unity, it chose, and chooses, men who never believed in it, the advocates of federalism, the men who at one time persecuted its apostles.

The sense that they have no bond of intelligence and love with the Nation, forces the Government to dread popular progress, and adopt a policy of *resistance*. Its rule is, never to give way to public opinion, except when it threatens to break out irresistibly in open conflict.

This is the fundamental basis of our attack. The rest, the perversion of the army from its primitive and only mission, *the safeguarding of the national soil and honour*, to become an instrument of repression within the country, the creation of an army of useless officials, to acquire an undue influence in the provinces, the repudiation of local liberties, the absence of an international policy, the ruin of the finances, a system of unjust and excessive taxation, are only a series of

consequences which logically derive from that first irrevocable set of circumstances.

Those who deny this in the face of History and the most recent events, delude themselves. Those who, in the Chamber or outside, attempt to guide Italy to its *ideal* without first removing this source of all our difficulties, deceive themselves and the country. They are laying up for themselves—and we deplore it—discredit and isolation. They are laying up for the country, yet more prolonged and violent crises, the more violent the more Italy stands in an exceptional position,—the position of a Nation in process of formation, for which, like a child, any deviation from the standard that educates to high and noble things may have a peculiarly and terribly fatal result.

To us the question is wholly a moral one. A form of Government either leads to good or corrupts. A form of government that is based on lies, or that has no life, and therefore cannot infuse it, condemns the country—whether consciously or unconsciously is immaterial—to a career of errors and crimes, or else by breaking up the moral unity of the Nation, and condemning it to a war of its own members that fetters its movements, ends by making it sceptical and egotistic, and drugging it to sleep. And sleep for a people of ancient growth, strong in the education of the centuries, and recognised by the other peoples as having largely fulfilled its mission, for such a people sleep is more

or less dishonourable, but not deadly. But sleep, or long delay, is at once dishonourable and deadly to a people like ours, that is rising to become a Nation, and must therefore of necessity grow, and yet cannot without a power to direct its forces to one end, a people that is pondering the road it has to follow, the road which will determine the acceptance or refusal of brotherhood with other Nations.

To one who sees in a Nation something more than an aggregation of individuals born to produce and consume corn, the foundations of its life are, fraternity of faith, consciousness of a common *ideal*, and the association of all faculties to work in harmony and with success towards that ideal. You cannot make it believe that life and growth are possible in a never-ending dualism between its government and itself, that

fast losing the national political sense, and lending an eager ear to the fatal whisperings of a federalist school that was dumb ten years ago. The middle class is becoming—as its abstention from the elections proves—more and more indifferent to the exercise of its political rights. The Chamber, part of it blindly subservient to government influence, part of it tied by the narrow formula which the Deputies swear, though they know it to be false and hurtful, has parted with its initiative, and is every day losing the importance that should belong to it. A feeling of torpor, the feeling of a man who sees no remedy for recurring dangers, infects men's minds with scepticism, and entices them from the public arena to the exclusive care of their own private concerns. What between the examples given in high places, and the logical consequences of the spread of materialism, which is partly the result of the Government's false tactics towards a dying religion, morality is losing its hold on the public mind. This is how Nations die, not how they are born.

It is high time to leave a policy of expedients, of opportunism, of entanglements and crooked ways, of parliamentary hypocrisy, concealment, and compromise, that characterises the languid life of worn-out nations, and return to the virgin, loyal, simple, logical policy that derives directly from a moral standard, that is the consequence of a ruling *principle*, that has always inaugurated the young life of peoples that are called to high destinies.

The first condition of this life, is the solemn declaration, made with the unanimous and free consent of our greatest in wisdom and virtue, that Italy, feeling the times to be ripe, rises with one spontaneous impulse, in the name of the Duty and Right inherent in a people, to constitute itself a Nation of free and equal brothers, and demand that rank which by right belongs to it among the Nations that are already formed. The next condition, is the declaration of the body of religious, moral, and political *principles* in which the Italian people believes at the present day, of the common ideal to which it is striving, of the *special* mission that distinguishes it from other peoples, and to which it intends to consecrate itself for its own benefit and for the benefit of Humanity. And the final condition, is to determine the methods to be employed, and the men to whom the country should delegate the function of developing the national conception of life, and the application of its practical consequences to the manifold branches of social activity.

Without this, a *country* may exist, stumbling along from insurrection to insurrection, from revolution to revolution, but there cannot exist a NATION.

And these three conditions can only be fulfilled by a NATIONAL CONTRACT, dictated in Rome by a constituent assembly elected by direct or indirect\* suffrage, and by all the citizens that Italy contains.

\* The writer prefers an indirect suffrage in two removes, but this is a question to be discussed in one of the ensuing numbers.

The National Contract is the inauguration, the baptism of the nation. It is the *initiative* that determines the normal life, the successive and peaceful development of the forces and faculties of the country. Without that *initiative, which gives life to the exercise of the vote*, and directs it to the common *ideal* under the guidance of a *principle* and a *moral doctrine*, even popular suffrage is at the mercy of arbitrary influence, or the passions of the day, or the false suggestions of ambitious agitators. Plebiscites taken under circumstances like these, the perverted and unenlightened expression of mere brute numbers, have, within the space of a few years, led, and will lead again, to a republic, a limited monarchy, and the despotism of a Bonaparte. Until a people is educated to uniformity and brotherhood, the initiative determines in every place and time the character of the solemn acts to which the masses are called.

Everyone knows what is the form of government that we believe to be the logical deduction from the principles in which we believe, and from the national Italian tradition: we define it as *the development and application of a Nation's ideal, duly entrusted by the chosen of the Country to men of recognised capacity and proven virtue*. We hope to show in our publication how it is only by adopting this formula of government that Italy can escape an indefinite series of more or less fatal crises, and fulfil her destinies, great, prosperous, educated to virtue. Quite recently it was

said to us by partisans of the government · "Write and discuss with us Every way of public propaganda is open to you. Why is that not enough? We have a right to combat conspiracies and attempts at insurrection, but we will all respect the peaceful and philosophical expression of ideas" We reply once again to the invitation, and write We have often attempted it, but the Government did not keep faith with its interpreters, and answered our statements, even when they only repeated the pages of History, by sequestering our property, and prosecuting us, without anyone protesting against its action

Nevertheless, we make another attempt, if only to see whether the Government can ever learn wisdom, or if the men who gave this invitation will join us to protect liberty of thought Our publication is frankly Republican, but it will not call to arms, or teach the people to rise, or provoke rebellions

When Italians are once convinced they will act for themselves We, who are ever ready to follow them by any means, or any paths that may lead, without crime, to the *ideal*, will use the present to meet the errors and prejudices which are constantly turning many minds from the idea that is the basis of our mission When we undertake to discuss in theory the present and future condition of Italy, Italians will be able to gauge from the attitude of the Government towards us, the measure of its conscientiousness and moral strength

And we will, above all, meet the errors that proceed from our own camp, and degrade, and warp, or lessen the purity of our Ideal. Many of the accusations that come from the opposite camp do not merit any lengthy refutation. Those who even now speak of anarchy and feebleness as inseparable from republican institutions, we can meet with the miracles of progress and power recently performed by the United States, and the steady peace which reigns by the side of liberty in the valleys of Switzerland. Those who are not ashamed to cast in our teeth their childish suspicions of popular tyranny, or terrorism, or spoliation, we can answer with the names of Venice and Rome, and all that we have done or written during the last forty years. But the materialism that shatters the unity of human nature, and while it supplies us with an object, suppresses all the noble impulses, all the sacred beliefs that stimulate us to fulfil it,—the false philosophies that lead, consciously or unconsciously, to the worship of accomplished *facts*, and success, and Force,—the schools of politics and of economics that select a single instance from among the manifold integral terms of the social problem, and deduce from it the solution of all secondary problems,—the blind, servile copying of the old French Revolution, still rooted only too deeply in most of our hearts, that fetters us with theoretical formulas of *individual rights* which are but the summary expression of a dead age which we have abandoned for the *initiative*



of the future age,—the excessive tendency to mete out the same blame, the same suspicion, so often unjust, to many who, like us, love the Fatherland, but are intellectually at fault as to method, that we mete to the few selfish schemers who, through thirst of lucre and power, consciously defile and betray the National Italian Revolution,—the narrow-mindedness that anathematises a grand and fruitful past out of hatred to a poor and feeble *present*, that falsifies History, that tries to deprive us of our glories, and denies the tradition which is the very life of Humanity,—all these deserve, and we will give them, an attentive and thorough examination. It is these and other errors brought to our Democracy from foreign schools of thought that has made the Italian intellect stray from the right path.

It is time to call it back from barren criticism to the National School, with its constructive methods, its tendencies to correlate and harmonise, from a materialism that presumes to understand, explain, determine motion while it destroys the motive power, to the old ever-present doctrine of the Spirit that harmonises motion and motor. As far as our powers permit we will try to accomplish this.

Only on this condition can Our National Revolution be achieved. Blind revolts lead only to victories of a day. Simple negations can overthrow an old worn-out edifice, they never lay the foundations of a new one, they never win a people to organised and effective action, or build the Temple of the Nation.

Our party is faithful to the ideal of our country's Traditions, but ready to harmonise them with the Traditions of Humanity and the inspirations of conscience; it is tolerant and moral, and it must therefore now confute, without attacking or misconstruing motives. We need not fear that we are forging weapons for the enemy, if we declare the religions of the world to be successive expressions of a series of ages that have educated the human race, if we recognise the religious faculty as eternal in the human soul, eternal, too, the bond between heaven and earth. We can admire in Gregory VII. the gigantic energy of will, the sublime moral effort that could not be realised with the instrument that Christianity could lend, and, at the same time, in the name of the progress we have made, declare the Papacy to be for ever dead. We can recognise the Mission which Aristocracy and Monarchy had for other peoples in the past, and yet proclaim, for all of us, the duty and the right to outstrip those worn-out forms. We may, without denying the reverence due to Authority—for that is the real object of all our efforts—claim the task of attacking every Authority that is not based on two conditions—the free and enlightened consent of the governed, and the power of directing the national life and making it fruitful.

We believe in God

In a providential Law given by Him to life

In a Law, not of the *Atonement*, not of the *Full*, and

*Redemption* by the *grace* of past or present mediators between God and *man*, but of *PROGRESS*, unlimited Progress, founded on, and measured by, our works

In the *Unity* of Life, misunderstood, as we believe, by the Philosophy of the last two centuries

In the *Unity* of the Law through both the manifestations of Life, *collective* and *individual*

In the immortality of the *Ego*, which is nothing but the application of the Law of *PROGRESS*, revealed beyond doubt now and for ever by Historical Tradition, by Science, by the aspirations of the soul, to the Life that is manifested in the individual

In Liberty, by which alone exists responsibility, the consciousness and price of *progress*

In the successive and increasing *association* of all human faculties and powers, as the sole normal means of *progress*, at once collective and individual

In the *Unity* of the human race, and in the moral *equality* of all the children of God, without distinction of sex, colour, or condition, to be forfeited by *crime* alone

And hence we believe in the holy, inexorable, dominating idea of *DUTY*, the sole standard of Life *Duty* that embraces in each one, according to the sphere in which he moves and the means that he possesses, Family, Fatherland, Humanity Family the altar of the Fatherland, Fatherland the sanctuary of Humanity, Humanity a part of the Universe, and a temple built to

God, who created the Universe, that it might draw near to Him. *Duty*, that bids us promote the progress of others that our own may be effected, and of ourselves that it may profit that of others. *Duty*, without which no *right* exists, that creates the virtue of self-sacrifice, in truth the only pure virtue, holy and mighty in power, the noblest jewel that crowns and hallows the human soul

And finally, we believe, not in the doctrines of the present day, but in a great religious manifestation founded upon these principles, that sooner or later will arise from the initiative of a people of freemen and believers—perhaps from Rome if Rome knows her mission—and which, while it includes that chapter of Truth that former religions won, will reveal yet another chapter, and will open the road to future progress, destroying in their germ all privilege and intolerance of caste

We have wished to express our principles briefly, that all who wish to help us may know what are the conditions of fellowship on which we will gratefully accept their help and counsel. From these derive all the rules that we prefix to questions of the intellect, and politics, and economics. We believe that to make politics an *art*, and sever them from morality, as the royal statesmen and diplomatists desired, is a sin before God and destructive to the peoples. The *end* of politics is the application of the moral Law to the civil constitution of a Nation in its double activity, domestic and foreign. The *end* of

economics is the application of the same Law to the organisation of Labour in its double aspect, production and distribution. All that *makes* for that *end* is Good and must be promoted, all that contradicts it or gives it no help must be opposed till it succumb. People and Government must proceed united, like thought and action in individuals, towards the accomplishment of that mission. And what is true for one Nation is true as between Nations. Nations are the individuals of Humanity. The internal national organisation is the instrument with which the Nation accomplishes its mission in the world. Nationalities are sacred, and providentially constituted to represent, within Humanity, the division or distribution of labour for the advantage of the peoples, as the division and distribution of labour within the limits of the state should be organised for the greatest benefit of all the citizens. If they do not look to that *end* they are useless and fall. If they persist in evil, which is egotism, they perish nor do they rise again unless they make Atonement and return to Good.

But to staunch the two sources of our worst wounds,—the dissention between the Government and the governed, and the selfishness that dominates individuals,—we must constitute a Government that represents the mind, the tendencies, the duties of the Nation, and we must determine the National ideal, the origin and standard of our duties. The former is a problem of form to be solved, in any practical way, by the

initiative of the whole country; the latter must be solved by the delegates of the nation, who shall make a NATIONAL CONTRACT, and found a system of national and compulsory Public Education, which the Contract shall determine.

For both, the preliminary and essential question, is to recognise and proclaim where the Sovereignty resides

Two Schools, both foreign, both founded on that dismemberment of the unity of human nature to which we have drawn attention, now hold the field, and solve in their several ways the philosophico-religious, political, and economic questions that are exciting interest in Europe

The first places sovereignty in the *individual*, in the *Ego*. With no conception of Law, and hence none of collective duty, it finds, wherever it turns, a partial, temporary expression of life, the doctrine of *Rights* supreme, inviolable, it bases all organisation on this latter doctrine. The spontaneous action of the individual, whether it leads to a power that is only *de facto*, or whether it instinctively reaches a standard of justice and truth, always bears, in its eyes, the mark of a *Sovereignty*. According to the disciples of this school, self-interest, or if that be insufficient, the action of the preponderant force, is sufficient to prevent the inevitable conflicts among all these petty local *sovereignities* from degenerating into civil war. This School leads, in Religion, to *protestantism* with the more timid, who stop

half-way, to *materialism* with those whose logic is more thorough. In politics it leads to *federalism*, to the almost absolute independence of local interests, to absolute liberty of education, to systematic distrust of all governmental control, and in international life to *non-intervention*. In economics it leads to *unlimited* competition, to the recognition of every acquired right without considering whether it is fatal to the progress of the majority, to the unrestricted doctrine of *laissez faire*. It accepts liberty alone among human faculties as the basis of civil society. The State is regarded as merely an aggregation of *individuals*, without any common *ideal* except the satisfaction of personal *interests*, the Nation as an aggregation of Communes, all sovereign and arbiters of their own development, and Government as a necessary evil, to be limited as much as possible, and confined to the exercise of a coercive force in cases of mutual robbery or slaughter.

The other School is opposed to the first on every point. It places sovereignty exclusively in the *collective* will, in the "*We*," and inevitably concentrates it slowly in the hands of a few, if not of a single man. The State is everything the individual practically nothing. The social ideal is absolutely binding, and must be accepted by him. The Nation absorbs all independent local life in a strong centralised government. The ideal that directs the Nation is supposed, theoretically, to be founded on the *good*, practically it is neither confirmed,

nor elaborated, nor modified by the intervention of the free examination or consent of the citizens. According to their system, the best are, and ought to be, called to apply it, but not by the people, they, the majority at least, have no part in the choice of the few who are already declared to be the most capable of the nation. *Association* is predetermined and ordained, but by authority and on a uniform and fixed plan. The instruments of Labour and of Production are one by one handed over to the State. The conditions of distribution are decided by authority. This school leads, in religion, to *Catholicism* with the timid, to *Pantheism* with the strong-minded. In politics it leads to despotism, whether of one, or a few, or many, is immaterial. In economics it leads to the search—the probably fruitless search—for a limited degree of material prosperity, at the cost of all possibility of progress or of increased production, at the cost of every stimulus to the growth of activity, the inventiveness, the initiative of the individuals. Just as Liberty is everything to the former School, so is Authority to this.

We reject those two Schools, which, under whatever name they appear, only continue the *dualism* of the doctrine which we declare dead. The republican form of government, as we understand it, places the centre of movement in a higher sphere, in which the two much-abused terms, Liberty and Authority, shall not conflict, but harmonise with one another.



The problem that is agitating the world is not the rejection of authority, for without authority, moral anarchy, and therefore sooner or later material anarchy, are inevitable. It is the rejection of all lifeless authority which is founded on the mere fact of its existence in the past, or on privileges of birth, riches, or aught else, and maintained without the free discussion and assent of the citizens, and closed to all progress in the future. It is not the rejection of liberty, whose absence makes tyranny inevitable. It is the restoration of the idea contained in that word to its true meaning—*the power to choose, according to our tendencies, capacity, and circumstances, the means to be employed to reach the end*. It is the rejection of the liberty which is an *end* to itself, and which abandons society and the mission of humanity to the caprice of the impulses and passions of individuals. *Authority* and *Liberty*, conceived as we state them, are equally sacred to us, and should be reconciled in every question awaiting settlement. *All things in Liberty and for Association*—this is the republican formula. Liberty and Association, Conscience and Tradition, Individual and Nation, the “*I*” and the “*We*” are inseparable elements of human nature, all of them essential to its orderly development. Only in order to co-ordinate them and direct them to a purpose, some point of union is required which is *superior* to all. Hence practical necessity leads us inevitably back to the high principles that we enumerated in theory in an earlier part of our work.

Sovereignty exists neither in the "*I*" nor the "*We*", it exists in God, the source of Life, in the PROGRESS that defines life, in the Moral Law that defines Duty

In other terms, Sovereignty is in the IDEAL

We are all called to do its work

The knowledge of the *ideal* is given to us—so far as it is understood by the age in which we live—by our intelligence when it is inspired by the love of Good, and proceeds from the Tradition of Humanity to question its own *conscience*, and reconciles these two sole criteria of Truth

But the knowledge of the *ideal* needs an *interpreter* who may forthwith indicate the means that may best attain to it, and direct its application to the various branches of activity. And as this *interpreter* must embrace within itself the "*I*" and the "*We*," Authority and Liberty, State and Individual, and as, moreover, it must be *progressive*, it cannot be a man or any order of men selected by chance, or by the prerogative of a privilege unprogressive by its very nature, or birth, or riches, or aught else. Given the principles contained in the contract of faith and brotherhood, this interpreter can only be the People, the Nation

God and the People. These are the only two terms that survive the analysis of the elements which the Schools have given as the foundation of the social communion. Rome knows by what paths of self-sacrifice, civil virtue, and glory, the banner that bore

these two solemn words inscribed upon it, awakened in 1849 the love of Italy for her

And here for the present we may stop The Italian Mission is therefore —

The Unity of the Nation, in its *maternal* aspect, by the reconquest of the Trentino, of Istria and of Nice, in its *moral* aspect, by National Education, accompanied by the free and protected Instruction of every heterodox doctrine

Unity of defence, or the *Nation armed*

Unity of the Contract and every Institution that represents the civil, political, and economic progress of all Italians

Steady activity of the legislative power, and the administration of the institutions that concern the national progress, to be entrusted, not to the executive power, but to Commissions by delegation from the legislative

Communal liberty to be decreed so far as regards the special progress of the various localities

Suppression of all offices intended at the present day to represent an undue influence of the Government over the different local districts

Division of powers to be a consequence, not of an illogical distribution of *sovereignty*, but of the different functions of government

A smaller number of State employees and a more equal payment for their services

Abolition of political oaths

Universal Suffrage as the beginning of political education

Legislation tending to advance the intellectual and economic progress of those classes that need it most, and the nation to encourage industrial, agricultural, and labour associations, founded on certain general conditions, and of proven morality and capacity

Special attention to be given to the uncultivated lands of Italy, to the vast unhealthy zones, to neglected communal property, and to the creation on them of a new class of small proprietors

A general system of taxation so as to free life—that is, the necessities of life—from all burdens, and so as to fall proportionately on superfluities, and avoid excessive expenses of collection

Abolition of all impediments to the free circulation of produce within and without the country

An economic system based on the saving of all useless expenditure and on the progressive increase of production

Recognition of every debt contracted by the Nation in the past

Simplification of the transfer of land

Abolition of monopolies

Responsibility of every public servant.

International policy to be governed by the moral *principle* that rules the Nation

Alliances to be based on uniformity of tendencies and objects

Especial favour to be shown to every movement that may fraternise Italy with the elements of future or growing Nationalities, with the Greek, Roumanian, or Slave populations, who are destined to solve the problem of Eastern Europe

These, with many others, are but the consequences of the great *principles* we have enunciated, and will be developed in our Publication, and, if the Italians will help us with their effective assistance, a more popular explanation will be given in a paper which we will add, dedicated specially to the Working Classes

## THOUGHTS ON THE FRENCH REVOLUTION OF 1789.

### *No XI of the "Roma del Popolo"*

IN 1835, when the French republican party was singularly powerful in its secret and public organisation, in men of strong intelligence, of generous daring and a civic courage till then too little known among us, when an insurrection seemed imminent and success seemed probable, and the eyes of all Europe were turned with anxiety and confidence to France, I wrote in a French Review\* —

"The *initiative* is lost in Europe, and while each of us ought to be working to recover it, we persist in trying to persuade the peoples that it still lives, active and potent.

"Since 1814 there has been a void in Europe, and, instead of labouring to fill it up, we deny the fact.

"From 1814 onwards, there has been no people to take the initiative, and yet we persist in saying the French people has the power.

\* "On the Revolutionary Initiative," in the "*Revue Républicaine*"

*"The French Revolution must be considered, not as a programme, but as a summary not as the initiative of a new age, but as the last formula of an expiring age."*

"The progress of the peoples depends to-day upon their capacity to emancipate themselves from France

"The progress of France depends upon its power to emancipate itself from the eighteenth century and the old Revolution"

The present article is a commentary on those words

I write it, because I see even to this day, more vivid and potent than I had believed, the inordinate prestige possessed by France and the memories of its great Revolution over the minds of our young men, a prestige that delayed our re-awakening for long years, and still delays its completion or threatens to pervert its direction. The events of the past thirty-six years have confirmed in unmistakable language the truth of that statement France still, as always, is self-deluded, believes herself to be the leader of European progress, and has from that time forth, almost of necessity, been moving in a circle, from monarchy to republicanism, from republicanism to despotism, and now she seems to be beginning the same revolution once again. Equally incapable of repose or normal motion, never able, whether under monarchy or republic, at home or abroad, to take one of those upward steps that open out a new horizon to Nations

already organised, or point an easier way for peoples wandering in search of a life as yet denied them. Nevertheless, the idea of France, mistress of the destinies of Europe and hasting to unfold them for the good of all, ploughs to-day like lightning through the soul of the young Italian generation, even as, when I faced the first battles and sorrows of life, it dominated the soul of the generation that is now dead or in lethargic old age. In each convulsive movement of France's great fall our people dream that the *initiative* is reborn. Any thought that takes shape for a few days in Paris, even when it proves the dissolution of the old power which was based upon unity and the prevailing anarchy, finds among us thoughtless and indiscriminating applause. And at every fresh disillusioning, Italian lips utter, or Italian faces show, the cowardly thought *how should we attempt what France attempted and failed to do?* What are we condemned to crawl for ever behind *man king* or *people-king*? Is Italy doomed to be the satellite of a greater planet? Cannot its population of twenty-five millions do for the new Age what twenty-five millions of French did for the Age that is passing away?

Italy does not lack force, but the consciousness of the force that she has within herself, she lacks *collective* virtue, the trust of each city in its neighbour city, of each individual in his brother, the trust of all in the latent life that throbs in the tradition of a people that once was great, and is fated to be great again, the life that



makes a nation And among the many causes of this mistrust—catholicism, materialism, our long servitude, the contradiction between the *end* of our movement and the *means adopted* to reach it—not the least is the false conception universally prevalent of the characteristics and historic value of the Revolution in France Just as a new faith is only revealed when the majority agree in boldly declaring the exhaustion and extinction of the old one, just as a people surrounded by enemies only finds salvation in its own strength when it despairs of others' help, so a Nation can only move resolutely onward along the road that leads to prosperity and greatness, when it is convinced that others will not advance for it The initiative force which it fancies is elsewhere, and which perhaps is hidden in its own breast, cannot reveal itself, for no one thinks of evoking it

And another evil consequence results from the belief that the French Revolution has ushered in a new age,—the blind tendency to imitate its actions, copy its formulas, expend all our active strength in following out the consequences of its ruling ideas, without advancing to the discovery or the confirmation of new ones The three terms *liberty, equality, fraternity*, mark out the circle within which all our social philosophy revolves, it forgets that *association* is the mother-idea of our Age, an idea unknown to the official inspirations of the Revolution A bad and immoral definition of life, *the search after happiness*, filched from the catechism

of Volney and the French republican constitutions, rules with slight disguise the whole of our moral philosophy, and cannot help instilling the poison of Egotism into the veins of a society that nevertheless is said to believe in the Law of common Progress. A baseless speculation, without possible sanction, except in the brute *force* of individual *rights*, which was the one formula of every Assembly that controlled the Revolution, summarises the whole of our political science. We mutter the sacred words, DUTY and SELF-SACRIFICE, but leave their interpretation to the caprice of good instincts, and thus inadvertently admit all the aristocracies of *rights*, won just for themselves by one or another class. The theory that popular *sovereignty* should be exercised, not as the interpretation of a supreme moral Law which has been indicated by a *declaration of principles*, and diffused by a uniform National Education, but as the brutal despotism of figures, which one day leads to republican liberty, and on the morrow to the unlimited power of a usurper and tyrant,—the doctrine of the impossible divorce of Church and State, both, to-day, phantasms and lies, but which nevertheless are destined sooner or later to represent the harmony between *principles* and their *application*,—the debased conceptions of *authority*, with which Democracy wages war solely because the authority of to-day is a lifeless corpse, though in the ultimate analysis authority is the end and aim of all our efforts,—

the insane admiration for a period of *terrorism* which some have taken for energy, but which was only fear and which prepared France for the Empire, and even now makes a number of unthinking enemies of Republican Institutions,—these and other fatal errors all derive from that initial error that makes us forget our own tradition and its message, and fetters us to the tradition that the French Revolution was the *beginning* of the present age, whilst we are all, consciously or unconsciously, apostles and heralds of an Age that is about to dawn. In the meantime, the few bad men who are opposed to us, and the many credulous men who accept their charges without examination, take advantage of that error to prophesy from the Republic, as we understand it, the same consequences as the deeds that stain, only too deeply, the glories of the French Revolution.

The statement that I shall attempt to prove in my article would, if true, ultimately change in part the direction of that most important science called the philosophy of History, which we define as the *perception* of the great Tradition of Humanity. To-day, thanks to the avowed materialists who do not understand it, and the materialists disguised as Hegelians who misunderstand it, that perception risks being lost. And National tradition, which is so large a part of that of Humanity, is forgotten. The writers and ministers of the monarchical party have converted it into a miserable *machiavellism* that dates precisely from the time when the princely vassals of Charles V and

Clement VII. interrupted that tradition. Perhaps, imperfect and weak, as my work must inevitably be, it may arouse some few to revive it among the young who have warm hearts and austere genius. In any case, it will not be out of place if, in the absolute lack of historical works on the French Revolution among us, at least one Italian should recall us to the need of considering that great event without either blind servility or culpable antagonism, and starting from a standpoint different from that taken by the French and other earlier writers

I

*No XII of the "Roma del Popolo"*

In a book nobly conceived and boldly written, my friend Edgar Quinet asks himself in tones of grief\* why the political results secured by the Revolution are so much inferior to the force, the gigantic energy, expended in its course. How is it that even now we are obliged to fight for the rights that it proclaimed more than eighty years ago, obliged to fight for that Liberty for whose sake nearly two millions of men sacrificed their lives? And he answers that it is because, instead of looking the religious problem in the face, which is the basis of every Society in process of formation, instead of resolutely parting from Catholicism

\* *La Révolution*, Vol II Book V c v 1865

and attacking it as Christianity attacked Paganism, the Revolution hesitated, uncertain, vacillating, before the problem, and timidly, hypocritically, condescended to a compromise with Catholicism. All the other causes to which he refers in the course of his work are in his view secondary and inferior.

But why did that cause exist? Why, in a generation who were very giants in strength of will, did their daring fail them here? A Revolution is never complete, says the writer, except on condition of embracing and following a new belief, or the rejection and open severance from an old one\*. Why did the Revolution effect neither the one nor the other?

Quinet does not try to solve this question so indispensable to the right understanding of the mission, the value, the historical significance of the Revolution. He too, like all French writers, was tempted away by the idea that the *initiative* belongs to France. He, in the sphere of thought, succumbed to the timidity and uncertainty for which he reproved the Revolutionists in the sphere of action. He wanders in the dim domain of an irrational, illogical despair. He sets to the fault of *individuals* what belongs to the necessity of things, to the laws that govern events, at times he misunderstands the role of the revolutionary leaders, at times he contradicts himself†, he leaves the reader

\* Book V c. 1

† "The idea that predominates to day, and it is the true one—the

at the end of a long, and in many aspects, splendid work, in the same darkness that he undertook to dispel, still doubtful of the road to be followed in the future

The answer to that last question is this —

The Revolution was unable, in spite of all its daring, to accomplish the impossible. The Revolution was directly descended from Christianity. The inspiration that ruled its actions never passed beyond the limits of Christian principles. Its work was to apply to mundane affairs, to political life, the fundamental ideas that Christianity had pointed to the world as belonging to the spiritual order of things, to be only verified by man in heaven.

Christianity is the Religion of the *individual*. The *collective* and *progressive* life of Humanity, and of its component nations, is unknown to its dogmas or its moral doctrines. Christianity consecrated the two aspects, internal and external, of *individuality*, it knew nothing of *association*, which we know now to be the only method of Progress. It regarded men as *brothers*, because they were the sons of one God, but the *ideal*

separation of Church and State, was very far from the minds of men in 1789" (Book V c. 1.), and further on — "It was reserved for our times to fancy that the human soul has nothing to do with political action, that the same man might be forced in one direction in religion, in another in politics, and that so radical a destruction of the human conscience might be effected without injury" (Book V. c. vii.)

was a personal, and not a *collective* one, and *each individual* had indicated to him the way to attain the *ideal*, without learning that it was needful for this very end to unite the capabilities and powers of *all*. To save oneself, not *through* the world, or by working with the world, but *in spite* of the world—that was the supreme formula of Christianity

The Revolution being a result of the Christian teaching, could neither rebel against it, nor free itself from it. The Revolution tried to introduce into political matters the *liberty, equality, fraternity* of men. Its theory of *rights* gave the political formula of the *individual*, it did not go beyond that. It did not found a *new* Society, it prepared the old one for liberty and equality. Liberty—even when it is given to *all*, and called Equality—*cannot* found a new Society, Association alone can do that. Liberty is no more than an element of social life. It provides the materials—it does not breathe into them the breath of life.

The Revolution, being the daughter of Christianity, did not cross its boundary, did not pass beyond its primitive inspiration. It might, if the Latin nations had not ingrained opposite tendencies, have adopted the protestant doctrine, and freed itself from Catholicism, but it could never escape from Christian forms \*

The Revolution therefore—save for those presentiments

\* In Quinet's book the question never goes beyond the terms of the acceptance or rejection of Catholicism, which is only one

of the future that permeate every great Revolution—was not the *beginning* but the compendium, the *conclusion* of an age—a practical summary of the conquests of the past; not a *programme* of future conquests

All the actions, the vacillation, the apparent contradictions, the conquests, the vagaries of the Revolution, and its descent to the Empire, find an easy explanation from this point of view. And if I am, as I believe, right, the Christian Age is concluded; France's mission to *initiate* is completed. We have another conception of Life, and travel in search of a new earth and a new heaven. And the first People who shall arise in the name of that conception, with the faith that says, *I can*, and the energy that says, *I will*, and cry to the other peoples, "I am fighting for you all, follow me," this People will give its name to an Age.

## II

Among the French historians of the Revolution,—putting aside the first simple narrators who were more or less judicious in the choice of facts, more or less able to recall them, and at whose head are Thiers and Mignet,—putting aside among the more recent, Louis Blanc, who excels in many merits of clear and elegant style, in his thorough study of documents, and intel-

of the forms of Christianity; and it might be said that for the new age he only sees the necessity of a *Christian* transformation. Book XIII c. vi.



lectual grip of several social questions, but who is twisted by his blind partisanship for the men of the mountain, and destitute of the philosophico-religious sense,\*—Bucheze stood alone in seeing in the French Revolution a product of Christianity. He was the founder of a School that had glimpses of many great truths, but lost their fruits by mixing them with serious errors. He understood that the essence of the Revolution was Christian, but believing as he did in the eternity of Christianity, and not divining its slow death-agonies,

\* Louis Blanc in his work starts from a distinction between *three great principles* that, *separately*, he says, *dominate the world and history*—namely, *authority, individualism, and fraternity*, and this is one of those arrogant, rash formulas that get repeated without examination, fascinate our young men, and falsify the sober, stern character of the Italian genius. In the meantime, to prove how much he misconceives the philosophic value of those three words, he begins by defining *authority* as the principle *that entrusts the life of nations to blindly accepted beliefs, to a superstitious respect for tradition, to inequality, and that employs force as a means of Government*. Such authority is, I will not call it Christian, but Catholic. Authority is a general and ruling principle, freely accepted as the basis of a society. Sacred as Liberty is sacred, it represents Tradition—that is to say, the sum total of acquired truths—just as Liberty is the security for further progress along the paths of other truths, truths that shall constitute a basis for a new Authority. The fact is, the world is always moving in search of *Authority*, and has neither life nor progress save in and by it. Only, all *Authority*, representing as it does, a definite and limited sum of Truth, is exhausted and perishes when it has fulfilled its mission; and to him who persists in upholding it in its decay, Revolutions reply, that they intend to bury it and win a new one.

Louis Blanc may say, I cannot, on what foundation the Fraternity which he desiderates can rest, when all *authority* is destroyed and *individualism* condemned.

believing too that the *Évangile* had been given to France for all time, he saw in the Revolution the *beginning* of a new Era, in which a transformed Christianity would be converted into a social religion, and would make a reality of the *Kingdom of God* on earth. But this is to win the impossible. A religion is never transformed, it exhausts the potentialities of life contained in the *principle* that created it, and then it dies, leaving that principle among the number of acquired truths. A given *end* is never reached by an instrument designed for another purpose. A faith that has for its *end*, the salvation of the *individual*; for its *means*, the belief in a *mediator* between God and the individual, for its condition, *Grace*, for dogma, the *fall* and *redemption* through another's works—such a faith can never found a Society which, though it works for the same *end*, has for *means*, the belief in the *collective* life of Humanity, the sole mediator between God and the individual, for its condition, the works that we have done on the earth, for its doctrine, Progress. An attempt like that of the French Revolution, and guided by a gigantic energy of purpose, was made six centuries before. What Gregory VII attempted, however superficially others may judge him, was to destroy the dualism between two powers, and the organisation of a world living a *collective* life, with the instrument supplied by Christianity; not finding in Christianity sufficient virtue to reach his end, he was led to try, like the Revolution, and

with similar futility, a policy of violence and terrorism, imposing celibacy by decree, and inflicting death upon souls by excommunication

Other writers—the latest and most important being Michelct, the author, I will not say of the best book on the Revolution in its *historical* aspect, but the book most imbued with a moral standard of judgment that I know of—struck by certain incidents of rebellion common to all Revolutions, and neglecting for excrescences and foreshadowings inseparable from all great national movements, that which constitutes their essence and definition, saw in the French Revolution a great rejection of Christianity, and hence the *beginning* of a new Era. Christianity, in the opinion of those writers, is the reign of *grace*, the Revolution the reign of *justice* and the abolition of privilege. And they appeal, moreover, to Voltaire and Rousseau, to the inspirers of the Revolution, who were all, as they say, anti-christian

I will touch presently on the course of ideas and tendencies followed by Voltaire and Rousseau, and how far the Revolution waged war without truce against privilege, and inaugurated the reign of justice, will, I hope, appear from the whole of this work. But I think I must here make two observations to facilitate the development of the question

The first is, that to estimate clearly the historical value of a Revolution, we must distinguish between the opinions of individuals, and the facts of the

Revolution itself. Men, during Revolutions, almost always surrender themselves to the impulses that dominate the multitudes, and compromise with their own. It matters little that Mirabeau, and perhaps many others in the Assembly, took their inspiration from the irreligious scepticism of Voltaire, for when, with the view of overcoming the opposition of the clergy to the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, and proving that the existing religion ran no risk, the Carthusian Serle proposed in April 1790 that the Assembly should declare the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman religion, the religion of the State, and its worship alone authorised, and when the whole of the Right of the Assembly applauded his motion, Mirabeau, pretending to be astonished by the doubt which it implied, asked, "whether it were necessary to decree that the sun shone," and another deputy, with equally sceptical opinions, quoted "the gates of hell shall not prevail against" Catholicism, wondering that those words should be confirmed by a poor human decree. It matters little that Robespierre derived all his views from Rousseau's writings, for when, in November 1792, Cambon proposed that the State should cease paying the salaries of the clergy, Robespierre declared that every attack upon the Catholic religion was a menace to popular morality, and contested the right of the Revolution to take an initiative by stating that 'it mattered little whether the religious opinions

followed by the people were prejudices or not, it was necessary, in any case, to base their reasonings upon them" The character of the Revolution must, in the series of the stages of Progress, be measured by what it *did*, not by what the revolutionists thought

The second point, which is almost always overlooked, is, that human effort along any stage of Progress is achieved *first* in the intellectual, *afterwards* in the practical sphere

A religion begins to die in the *mental* sphere—that is, in its dogma and ritual—when the *practical* application of its informing principle is in the first stage of its development in the field of civil and political facts Like all great ideas, each religious synthesis begins by being elaborated in the intelligence, in the sphere of *spiritual* activity The consequences are not realised in the sphere of *material* activity until the intelligence has completely assimilated that principle and is master of it But the continuity of Progress requires, that even before the work that centres round the vital idea of the religious system of the Age is fully completed, the mind should see yet another religion dawning on the far horizon, and begin a new task of development, either around or parallel to it In the meantime, as I said, the logical deductions of the old system are translated into facts in actual civil life

If this were not so, Progress could only move by fits and starts The human intellect would remain

stationary during the whole time that the idea is being practically applied, and practical genius, if the work of application is exhausted, would necessarily be stationary in its turn, until the new idea is fully evolved in the intellect. The periods of human progress, interrupted by these stationary periods, would, to re-connect themselves, need an impulse, some *initiative*, from a higher source. This is the theory of direct immediate *revelations*, which we reject as false, and contrary to all we can divine of the nature of God.

The anti-christian tendencies of some of the precursors of the Revolution do not therefore contradict my assertion. These thinkers, placed on the confines of two worlds, already had glimpses, not of the future religion itself, but of its necessity and the insufficiency of the old one; while, on the field of civil and political facts, the Revolution summarised and concluded the Christian Age.

### III

Christianity, setting aside its conception of heaven and its slow ingrafting of dogma, and considering it in its historical relation with other religions, is, as I have said, the religion of the *individual*, and this constitutes its vital essence, its mission.

In the slow and progressive development of the great formula of the Universe, the supreme word of which is

UNITY, and which assigns to all of us for a final *end* the conquest of the moral Unity of Humanity, so that each one of us may one day reflect the conception of the Law given us,—in this development, Historical Tradition (when we regard it, not with the presumptuous ignorance of modern materialists, but with the reverent attention due to the representation of our collective life, the sole standard from which we can deduce and verify the conception of the Law that governs it) shows us a series of great ages, all Hall-marked and defined by a religion, all intended to concentrate human activity on the evolution of one of the essential elements of the world's problem, God, Nature, the Individual, Humanity. Every age reveals, in part at least, a new term of the formula, and points to a new goal for the forces of the intellect. Every religion pours a fresh drop of the universal life into the human soul.

Of the ancient religions of the East, some had conceived of God as solitary, supreme, beyond the reach of human intellect, menacing as Fate, others, as sometimes blessing, sometimes cursing Nature. All of them neglected man, none suspected the ray of the divine ideal that is in him, the bond that joins him to the Infinite. On one side was an immense, inscrutable force, on the other, an immense, unconscious, passive weakness, and, between the two, Love had not yet traced with its wings a bridge for possible union. The East had expressed God alone, man lay crushed, a slave, the

sport of an inexorable Fate, or of the caprices of the deified forces of Nature.

The polytheistic religions expressed *man*, and his spontaneous nature. They rescued him from a pantheism that oppressed him, they had glimpses of the fact that in the scheme of the universe man had a part, but they did not succeed in defining this part. Ignorant of the *unity* of Life, and its double manifestation in man, *individual* and *collective*, conscious only of the former, they focussed the work of the intellect on the *individual*, and saw in him only the subjective existence of the *ego*—that is, *liberty*. But without conception of the mission of humanity, uncertain as to the *end*, and therefore as to the *means* to be pursued, the work was arrested, powerless to attain its purpose, in the face of a universal fact,—*inequality*, and they accepted this fact, decreeing by an infallible dogma the *two natures* in men. Greece and Rome nobly developed the idea of *liberty*, but for one class of men only. *Slaves* existed, by the doom of birth or conquest, side by side with the citizens.

The Christian Age came to complete the work begun by Polytheism, and to contemplate the *individual* in his other aspect, in his *external*, objective, relative existence. Its principal work was, therefore, to develop the idea of *equality*. The Mosaic religion had already established the vital dogma of the divine *unity*. Christianity appropriated this dogma, and, advancing a step further, withdrew it from the privilege of the *chosen* people in order to



diffuse it among *all* peoples The God of Moses was the God of Israel, of the Nation the God of Christianity was the God of men, who were necessarily brothers in Him The slow abolition of *slavery* was a consequence of the triumph of Christianity, of the evangelisation of the slave by the priests The immediate completion of emancipation being impossible, except at the risk of grave dangers, so barbarised and so brutalised were the slaves, there arose under the feudal system an intermediate stage of *serfdom*, but the Church itself represented in this respect the *ideal* As the guardian of that portion of the Moral Law which the times permitted, she abolished in her own ranks the fatality of birth and the hereditary principle, and made *merit* alone the basis of every ecclesiastical office

Beyond this Christianity neither did, nor could, proceed The prevalent conception of Life, knew nothing of *collective* Humanity, of the Law of Progress that governs us, of the Historical Tradition that reveals it and explains its *method*, of the solidarity that exists between past, present, and future generations, of the unity that binds together earth and heaven, the ideal and the real, the infinite and the finite With aspirations towards the future more potent than some think, with a worship of the *ideal* visible in Art, as in all the other Christian manifestations of the first thirteen or fourteen centuries, Christianity, placed between an *end* so tremendous and remote as salvation, or in other words, *perfection*, and on the other hand the feeble, unequal, isolated,

fruitless powers of the *ego*, active only for a brief period of time, Christianity was driven to two conclusions—first, the impossibility of solving the problem with the conditions of this life as they were then known, and next, the necessity for the intervention of a superior power independent of all law, in order to overcome the immense disparity between the *end* and the *means*. Hence the *divinity* given to Jesus, *grace*, the contempt of earthly things, the insufficiency of works, the ardent longing for heaven, which is the source of prayer, of isolation, of renunciation of the visible world, not of association, or the progressive transformation of the elements in which we live, or self-sacrifice to incarnate so much of the *ideal* as is possible *here below*, hence the divorce between the visible and the invisible world, between the life on earth and a kingdom of Justice and Love to be realised *only* in Heaven. Christianity received the idea of *liberty* that Paganism had worked out, added the idea of *equality*, and preached *charity* to the brethren, but it was a liberty purely spiritual, an equality of souls before God, a charity to be exercised between individual and individual only, and a part of the renunciation of earthly goods rather than an attempt to suppress the causes of pain and evil. Religion was not life, but a reward promised for a life to be accepted on the earth such as it was.

I am speaking of Christianity, not of Catholicism, which was at first a form of Christianity, then a deviation

from it. Even Protestantism, that was generally supposed to be a Revolution, and which many believed a progressive movement in Christianity, was practically nothing more than a protest in favour of intellectual *liberty*, that had been systematically violated by the Papacy, and, in a higher sense, an evidence, little understood by the Reformers themselves, of the slow extinction of the Christian age. Sixteen centuries had exhausted the vigour of the Christian philosophy. The human spirit was bound to move again towards another and vaster philosophy, hence the necessity for a strong assertion of the individual, and for that right of private judgment without which every attempt to pass the limits of the old belief would have failed. Protestantism unconsciously asserted it. And that was its sole mission in the world, it did not pass beyond the boundary of the age. The *sovereignty* of the individual—arbitrarily confined within the limits of the Bible—was its last word, re-echoed in the Arts, the Economics, the Politics that it inaugurated.

France took on herself the task to conclude the Age of the *individual*, which was sterilised and moribund, by two more centuries of dissolution. She summarised its conquests, its principles, its characteristics, and translated them practically into the sphere of civil life.

Did she cross the boundary?

Did she initiate the new Age?

## IV

Ideas rule the world and its events. A Revolution is the passage of an idea from *theory* to *practice*. Whatever men have said, material interests never have caused, and never will cause, a Revolution. Extreme poverty, financial ruin, oppressive or unequal taxation, may provoke risings that are more or less threatening or violent, but nothing more. Revolutions have their origin in the mind, in the very root of *life*, not in the body, in the material organism. A Religion or a philosophy lies at the base of every Revolution. This is a truth that can be proved from the whole historical tradition of Humanity.

Now, what were the ruling ideas in the period immediately preceding the Revolution? What were the doctrines that hovered over its cradle? What was it that inspired and baptised its development and the various parties that promoted it? Did they go beyond the confines of the Age of the *individual* and his *rights*? Did they intiate the Age of *Duty*, and of *Association*, the only means of fulfilling Duty?

Three men, Voltaire, Rousseau, Montesquieu, comprehended the whole intellectual movement of the eighteenth century, and exercised a visible and predominant influence on the development of the Revolution. Montesquieu, on the ideas of the Constituent Assembly, Rousseau, on the men of the Convention, Voltaire,

on the beginnings of the movement and certain general tendencies that re-appear intermittently to recall his name, and the indefatigable war he waged for fifty years against the traditions of the Church and the caprice of despotism

Voltaire's genius was quick, subtle, acute, analytic, encyclopædic, but not profound, he was moved by good and philanthropic instincts rather than by strong and reasoned moral beliefs, a warrior rather than an apostle, a hater of *evil* rather than a worshipper of *good*, too much extolled by some, too much depreciated by others, Voltaire founded no doctrine, but, as I have said, popularised tendencies,—tendencies that existed already, and were almost innate in the French genius, but to which he gave new force and clothed in noble language,—tendencies which leak out in a number of the events of the Revolution, and, excepting the more rigid puritans of the Mountain, from Camille Desmoulins to Barres, influence, one might say, every actor of the period. They were philanthropic tendencies, inspired by momentary impulses of kindness rather than by a conception of life, and of its law,—tendencies of a vague, sterile, superficial deism, that relegated God to heaven and sundered his undying connection with the world, and which was merely a compromise between the tradition still extant in the popular mind, and the scepticism that, however covertly, dominated Voltaire and his followers,—tend-

encies of antagonism to every imposed authority, to every form of superstition and fanaticism, but born rather of a sense of rebellion natural to one who *thinks*, than of faith in the destinies of those who have yet to *learn* to think,—tendencies that worshipped the rights of reason, but only for those individuals who by good fortune and education can share in them, and which were mingled with some spirit of contempt for the masses, a spirit which afterwards founded the fatal distinction between the popular and the bourgeois classes,—tendencies of equality, but confined, as in the philosophy of the ancients, to one order of men, regardless of the rest I have mentioned the bourgeois class, and Voltaire was, in fact, consciously or unconsciously, the teacher and master of the *bourgeoisie*, and his influence was all-powerful in the acts that, in the period just before the Revolution, traced the first lines of a division that has been more recently organised into a system, by Guizot and the French eclectic school. the *bourgeoisie* of the two Bourbon Revolutions idolised him. A man of impulses, of intuitions, rapid but short-lived, of enthusiasm, intellectual rather than moral, Voltaire, who displayed rare humanity in his efforts to clear the memory of Calas and the Sirven family, was flatterer at once of the Empress Catherine and King Fredenc of Prussia. He sanctified their crimes; he burlesqued, in low comic verse, the heroic resistance

of the Poles to the dismemberment of their Fatherland. An apostle of toleration in religious matters, he was the type of intolerance towards all his enemies, and capable of using any weapon, even calumny, to their prejudice. He waged a relentless, rabid war against catholicism, and when threatened with death wrote a declaration of catholic faith and repentance. I write this as a debt to my own conscience, and because I see arising among our young men, who have neither studied all his works nor his life, an intemperate and dangerous admiration for him, but it is more important to my present purpose to note how Voltaire destroyed prejudices and errors, but neither built nor cared for the future. He had no perception (his historical works and his theory that great events depend upon little causes prove this) of a Law dominating the life of Humanity, no perception of Progress, of a human mission, of Duty, of Association, or of anything that constitutes the *end* and the *method* of the new Era that he invoked. He recognised no standard of good except in the *rights* of the *individual*. And like all who start from the idea of *right* alone he could not help being

he gave full expression to the idea that guided him, when he uttered, under guise of a blessing on Franklin's young son, the sacred but insufficient words—*God and Liberty*, a formula that opens the way to a possible initiative, but does not itself initiate Liberty is a mere instrument of *good* or *evil* according to the path it chooses

Montesquieu, a more profound thinker than Voltaire, though less profound than some say, was the chief of a political School that had for its disciples, in the first period of the Revolution, Monnier, Malouet, and many others in the Assembly, Rivarol,\* Bergasse, Mallet Dupan,† and others in the periodical press. The influence of the ideas he expounded in the "*Esprit des Lois*," is visible in the acts of the Constituent Assembly.

His influence lay in his historical studies of antiquity, that would be thought superficial at the present day, but then appeared vast and almost unique. His intellect was acute, and swift in seizing the salient points of things, his aspirations were advanced, the expression of his thoughts vigorous. Montesquieu was at times unconsciously impelled, by his native logic, near to the unknown confines of the new Age, but he was hindered by his lack of any religious conception of the life of Humanity, by the prevailing theory of the ebb and flow of Nations, perhaps, too, by the inevitable influences of

\* *Actes des Apôtres*

† *Mercure Politique*



a semi-patrician birth and the conditions of office, and so he retreated ever more and more towards the old Age, and never, even in his most daring flights, crossed the limits of a period that began the transition. For an instant he caught a glimpse of the true definition of *liberty*, when he said that it consisted "in being able to do what one *ought* to will, and in not being constrained to do what one *ought not* to will" (Book XI. c. iii). But this was a momentary flash, an isolated saying, whose consequences he was unable to deduce. He suspected the existence of a general *end*, common to humanity, and a *special* end, belonging to each nation, but he was incapable of rising from that glimpse of an idea to the conception of a providential mission. He notes "that the object of Rome was aggrandisement, of Lacedæmonia, war, of the Judaic laws, religion, of Marseilles, commerce, of the barbarians, natural liberty", but he never saw that those *facts* were only *means* to reach the *end*, and that the appointed end is general progressive civilisation, the slow formation of a collective human *unity*. It is clear from twenty passages that he feels in his soul the superiority of the Republican form of government to all others, and yet, finding no body of *principles* that convert the intuition of the moment into a demonstrated truth, he concludes by labouring to teach how a monarchy may be durably established. He too, in all his researches, starts only from the individual, and so, like all who have no other

criticism of Truth, he can only grasp the notion of *right*. For him, as for the other philosophic thinkers of the time, there are *rights* consecrated by the *fact* of their existence, by prolonged possession, and the political programme is reduced to efforts to find a place for them in the social organism, and to seek an impossible equilibrium that shall preserve the peace among them, and prevent one right from doing violence to another. Placed between a monarchy that said "France is mine," an aristocracy powerful by past domination and an exclusive influence over the monarchy, and the first threatening murmurings of the *Tiers État*, Montesquieu did not pretend to pass judgment on those three forces, nor ascertain the sum of vitality that existed in each, and which was doomed to early death, which destined to long life in the future. They *existed*, and he accepted them, consecrating the labour of his intellect to co-ordinate their existence and functions in the organisation of the State. His ideal was the English system, the result, not of any conception of political philosophy, but of a unique historical development of causes and effects which existed nowhere else. His theory is that which we have seen in practice for more than half-a-century under the name of constitutional monarchy, where the search for an equilibrium between the three elements of Crown, and Nobility, and Commons, has everywhere condemned the peoples to alternate between stagnation, reaction, and periodic revolution.

The problem, therefore, in the *Esprit des Lois* is vitiated by a fundamental error. Montesquieu labours heavily about the distinction between the three Powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, and makes this the cardinal point of the whole question, he thus, by exaggerating this distinction, destroys the conception of National Unity. The real, the sole, the vital question should be, for him as for us all, the question of Sovereignty, what is its origin, and where its interpretation is to be sought with the least uncertainty and the greatest probability.

There does not, and ought not to exist more than one LAW, it is its application to the diverse branches of social life that implies a distinction in the higher branches of the administration between the different functions *delegated* to provide for its execution. Just as the exaggeration of the triple aspect of *life* in God changed little by little the three different *aspects* of divine action into Three Persons, and founded a Tri-theism in religion opposed to the conception of Unity, so the theory of rights, and hence of acquired rights, impelled Montesquieu to discover *powers* where they did not exist, and found a political Tri-theism which has survived even to this day, and impairs every conception of national organisation. Having raised these social elements to Powers, he confers on them attributes which suffice to break up the harmony of the State. He was confronted by the danger, either of antagonism between

the three powers, or compulsory stagnation, but he replied with superficial carelessness, "that, as they were urged forward by the necessary movement of things, they would be constrained to move in unison"

Montesquieu abounds in false ideas respecting the hereditary nature of the aristocracy, the function of the monarchy, the rights conceded to the *executive* over the legislative, and many other questions. But it is not my task to notice them. It is sufficient for my purpose to have reminded my readers of the thought that dominates his conceptions. He has no *criterion* outside that of the *individual*. He reaches no formula of political organisation beyond that of *rights*. He has no scope, no mission to suggest for the State, except *liberty*, and by *liberty* he understands, in the general course of his work, nothing more than "the citizen's consciousness of his own safety, and of having nothing to fear from any other citizen." Political science is therefore narrowed to a science of *limits*, of mutual defence. And the government, deprived of any other mission, is to use the force of society to watch that those limits are not overstepped by violence. A Religious conception, the Law of Progress, Duty, Association, the *end* assigned to Humanity and to each People, collective Education, and the office of the Press to gradually promote the unity of the human family, everything, in short, that is characteristic of the Age we call for, is unknown to the man who inspired the Constituent Assembly.

Montesquieu was neither inspirer nor prophet of an Age

He summarised, with singular acumen, the conditions and consequences of political laws as he found them, incomplete or in partial activity, in the period in which he lived. He sketched in outline, not always, but frequently exact, the existing tradition, but nothing more. When we point to him, at the present time, as the master of future legislation, we commit the same error as when we make poor Machiavelli the guardian of the cradle of reborn Italy—Machiavelli, who anatomised the dead body of old Italy and showed the wounds that caused her death, when we take Adam Smith—who was but the wise exponent of the laws that governed the economic phenomena of his time—and make him the founder of an immutable science, the teacher of an Age in which the economic relations between class and class are hastening to an inevitable change.

Rousseau, the inspirer of the Convention, followed another road, but without passing the confines of the Age that France was preparing to summarise. A poor plebeian, without deep study of the past, abhorring the times in the consciousness of his own superiority, and for the exaggerated demands of Society as he found it, he, on the great political questions of the day, questioned only his own intelligence and the intuitions of the heart. His intelligence was more powerful than that of Montesquieu, his heart was led astray by a leaven of

egotism that too often soured his natural inclination to good, and both together drove him to the principle that takes its birth, if not its consecration, from him—the principle of popular sovereignty. A true principle, if considered as the best method of interpreting a supreme Moral Law which a nation has accepted as its guide, which is solemnly declared in its Contract and transmitted by National Education, but a false and anarchical principle if proclaimed in the name of force, or in the name of a Convention, and abandoned to the caprice of majorities, uneducated, and corrupted by a false conception of life.

For Rousseau, the popular sovereignty remained in these last terms, uncertain, ineffective, shifting. He, too, had no conception of the collective life of Humanity, of its tradition, of the Law of Progress appointed for the generations, of a common *end* towards which we ought to strive, of *Association* that can alone attain it step by step. Starting from the philosophy of the *ego* and of *individual* liberty, he robbed that *principle* of fruit by basing it, not on a Duty common to *all*, not on a definition of man as an essentially social creature, not on the conception of a divine Authority and a providential design, not on the bond that unites the *individual* to Humanity of which he is a factor, but on a simple *convention*, avowed or understood. All Rousseau's teaching proceeds from the assertion "that social right is not derived from nature, but is based upon conventions"\*. He drives this

\* *Contrat Social*, in the first chapters

doctrine so far as to comprehend the family itself within it "Sons," he says, "do not remain united to their fathers except so long as they have need of them for their preservation . . . From that time forth the family is only maintained in virtue of a convention "

From the doctrine that recognises the rights of the contracting *individuals* as the only source of social life, nothing could result but a political system capable of protecting, within the limits of a narrow possibility, the *liberty* and *equality* of each citizen, and Rousseau has no other programme "The aim of every system of legislation"—these are his very words—"reduces itself to two principal objects, liberty and equality" (Book II c xi), and earlier, in c iv of Book I, "to find a form of society that shall *defend* and *protect* with all the collective forces the person and the property of each associate, and in which each one, uniting himself to all, shall obey only himself and remain as free as he was before, this is the fundamental problem " Stated in these terms, the problem contains neither the elements of normal progress, nor the possibility of solving the social *economic* question that is so prominently agitating men's minds in our time An isolated sentence in the book seems to lay down the principle that "no citizen ought to be rich enough to be in a position to buy another, none poor enough to be constrained to sell himself", this is just, but it does not connect itself with the general bearing of the *principles* he expounds, nor is there any indication

how it may be reduced to fact. It is of little importance that in many particulars he is superior to every other thinker of that period. The Society of Rousseau, like that of Montesquieu, is a mutual insurance society, and nothing more.

That first statement, the key of the whole system, is by now proven to be false, and, because false, fatal to the development of the principle of popular Sovereignty. It is not by the force of *conventions* or of aught else, but by a necessity of our nature that Societies are founded and grow. Each of us is a part of Humanity, each of us lives its life, each is called upon to live for it, to aid the attainment of the *end* assigned to it, to realise, as far as possible in each one of us, the ideal type, the divine thought that guides it. Law is one and the same for individual and collective life, both of which are the expression of a single universal phenomenon, differently modified by space and time. And life, we know now, is PROGRESS. If you throw over Moral Authority, our natural tendencies, our mission, and substitute the merely human authority of *conventions* as the source of social development, you risk arresting that development, or subjecting it to arbitrary caprice. And since you need the consent of all the contracting parties to dissolve these conventions and make a change for the better, you are threatened, on the one hand by the power of every minority, logically indeed of every individual, to stop you; on the other hand, inasmuch as the prolonged



existence of a *fact* pre-supposes, at all events, a tacit convention, you are threatened by the necessity of perpetuating rights and powers that are not founded on justice, or conducive to the common good. No "man" has, you say, "natural authority over his fellows. Might cannot create right, therefore conventions are left as the only basis of legitimate authority." But is there not an authority higher than any man, in the True, the Just, the *end* which we have set before us and which we are bound above all things to discover? Is not some of that authority passed on to the people or to that fraction of the people which is its best interpreter? And, to discover that *end*, do we not possess the double criterion supplied when the Tradition of Humanity and the conscience of our times both harmonise? And for a method of practical verification, can we not examine whether this item of discovered truth profits or not the common progress? Rousseau believed in God, but in his study of human phenomena he continually forgot Him.

Rousseau believed in God. He believed—and it is well to remind of this those republican materialists who venerate the *Contrat Social*—that a State could not be established without having religion for its foundation. And he pushed this belief to the fanaticism of intolerance, declaring (Book IV c. viii) that the Sovereign power could exile from the state all who disbelieved in God and Immortality, and condemn any citizen to death

who, after publicly confessing his belief in those dogmas, by his subsequent conduct convicted himself of deliberate falsehood. But he confined himself within a narrow deism that placed God far off in heaven, and never understood *his universal, never-dying life manifested* in Creation, he was ignorant of the Law of Progress—the sole but potent and living mediator between God and Humanity, he was fettered by the individualist philosophy, he had no glimpse of any religion besides Christianity, and so he was incapable of deducing and applying the logical consequences of his faith to Society.

Like Voltaire and Montesquieu, Rousseau was not the intellectual herald of an Age. His conception, though more daring, more explicit, more advanced than theirs, never passes the limits of the individualist world, elaborated by the Pagan-Christian Age. The influence of the three schools with which these names are associated, could not push the Revolution beyond those limits, to the World of Progress and Association for which we are now fighting.

#### V

Did France collectively effect what these three great and influential thinkers failed to effect? Did she, by virtue of enthusiasm, cross the boundaries of that world within which their doctrines were confined. Often, like intuition in the individual, Insurrection (which is the intuition of a people, the concentration of all

the faculties harmoniously directed to a given point), advances further than the slow, peaceful, solitary labour of the intellect. The electric spark, set free when the masses are kindled by a common aspiration and suddenly rise to self-sacrifice and victory, flashes more strongly through the darkness, and illumines a horizon more distant than what the pale, steady light of the sage's lamp reveals. Let us see if this was so.

The best method of gauging the value of a Revolution, is to thoroughly scrutinise the series of solemn declarations made in its name by the collective authorities, freely chosen by the people to represent the movement, or by the extra-legal movements of the people itself, when they announce a determined end, and leave a mark that points in the direction of the future. Every revolution has, by the very nature of things, isolated geniuses outside its own orbit. They are the aerolites of the moral world, and give indications of important eccentric phenomena, but teach us nothing as to the path of the planet. To select, as some do, from a speech of Claude Fauchet or St Just, a chance unconscious phrase, in contradiction with the whole, and argue from it the spirit of the Revolution, is to falsify the historic significance of great events, it is to mistake the aerolite for the planet.

The first solemn declaration of the spirit of the Revolution is seen in the Instructions given by the

electoral colleges to the deputies that represented the three orders, Clergy, Nobles, and Third Estate, in the States-General. The members elected numbered 1200; 600 for the Third Estate, 300 for each of the privileged orders. The electors, who voted indirectly, in two removes, for the Third Estate and the lower Clergy, and directly for the remaining members, reached the total of six millions.\*

Since the time of Louis XIV France had been suffering a material and moral decadence. Morally, the insolent, brazen corruption of the Court under the Regency of Philip of Orleans and Louis XV had infected the nobility and the higher *bourgeoisie*. The luxury, the decay in morals, the arbitrary rule of the Government and men of position was unbounded, one would be tempted to say that the details given us were lies invented by historians, were they not confirmed by contemporary documents. It is not my purpose to repeat them here, but the squandering of money, which, from the time of Louis XIV to the Regency, had run up the debt of France to three milliards, explains how a hundred servants were often collected in a single palace, how 150,000 francs were spent annually in dinners alone by a financier, Samuel

\* France—I could wish that the Italians, to-day bowed down before her because she was able to fight and vanquish Europe, should remember this—numbered then twenty-five millions of inhabitants.

Bernard, just as the seraglio of young girls, bought or kidnapped for the king,\* since the days of Pompadour, explains the private life of the nobles, of whom fifteen out of twenty did not live with their wives, and as the fifty State prisons, nearly all governed by Jesuits, into which the inmates entered for an indefinite time, without trial, and in virtue of a royal or ministerial order that the minister often gave away in blank or sold, explains the custom of fathers to imprison at times sons to be rid of the annoyance of a projected marriage, or of wives who thus escaped the over-watchful eyes of unloved husbands. Just as a lesion of the brain afflicts the whole organism with disease, so a corrupt monarchy, slowly but inevitably, corrupts the whole country. In the meantime, in contrast with this life in high places, poverty and misery had increased among the people, and most markedly among the cultivators of the soil, to a degree that would appear incredible, if we had not at hand the testimonies of men of all classes, men who were more than moderate in their views, from Bossuet to Fénelon, from Vauban to Boisguilbert, from the reports of the Intendants of the Provinces to those of the Minister Argenson. Speculators, seconded by the Government and the more covetous courtiers, traded on this misery, and had organised what was termed by contemporaries the *Part of Hunger*. By a series of market operations the

\* *Part aux Cerfs*

whole corn of the country was exported, and when the *premium* paid on exportations had been received, the whole stock was accumulated in Jersey or Guernsey and other depots, and sold again, when the needs of the people had reached their greatest extremity, at very high prices, as though it had arrived from America.

From such conditions, with these causes for indignation long repressed, there arose unexpectedly, suddenly, by the convocation of the States-General, which the urgent need of money had wrested from the king, a people of six millions, that gave voice to its wants in the Instructions. The frenzied, tortured soul of France and the character of the movement then beginning, were bound to be plainly revealed in them. And the Instructions—the *Cahiers* as they were termed in France—did reveal them. The Revolution, irritated by the many-sided opposition, developed a prodigious energy in the *means* it adopted to obtain satisfaction for the popular demands, but in substance, hardly, if at all, advanced beyond them.

The Instructions express an immense aspiration for *liberty* and civil *equality*. The individual, violated, repressed, downtrodden for centuries, panted for life, and asserted itself in the popular Programme given to the Revolution. But that Programme does not contradict the fundamental proposition of my article. It is not the programme of the new Age, that we who love, fight, and hope, foresee to-day. It is not based on a new definition.

of Life. It does not *initiate*, it reasons out, and summarises previous acquisitions of the intellect, which had been left sterile and inoperative in the sphere of facts. It does not escape from the circle of Christian inspirations, it only demands, like the Hussites, the *cup for all*, that the rewards promised in heaven shall be realised upon the earth, that the dogma of the salvation of the *individual* by means of *individual* works shall have an application in this world.

The Instructions of the Nobility are naturally inferior to the others. A breath of equality is, however, felt at times in their pages. They demand an equal distribution of taxes, the abolition of exceptional tribunals, uniformity of penalties for all, the abolition of ferocious punishments, the publicity of criminal trials. Some few among the localities suggest that all men of worth should be admitted to public offices. Three, Peronne, Montdidier and Roye, suggest that judges should be nominated by the king from lists drawn up by the people. But the old spirit shortly afterwards turns up, dominant, in the demand for the maintenance of seigneurial justice, of the exclusive right of hunting in feudal lands, of the exclusion of the non-noble from the higher military ranks, &c., and by these exceptions cancels their scanty instincts for good.

The Instructions of the Clergy, of the lower Clergy especially, are better, more frequently, so powerful is the influence even of worn-out and corrupt religion, inspired by a love of the people and a sense of more

advanced equality. In many localities, they demand a system of National Education, not to be left to local caprice, but based on uniform principles approved by the States-General, and also free schools for both sexes in every commune. In some they demand the erection of hospitals in the richer communes, and what is of more importance, the exemption from taxation of men who live by their daily toil, in others, measures in favour of public morality, a most righteous suppression of publications tending to corrupt it, and the repression of prostitution, in others again, the emancipation of the negroes. Politically they demand the permanency of the States-General, or their convocation at least every five years, ministerial responsibility, the abolition of all exceptional tribunals, the foundation of Boards of Arbitration, the inviolability of the secrecy of the Post, municipal freedom, and the election of communal magistrates by the people, the codification of the law, publicity of justice, the mitigation and equalisation of punishments, the abolition of judicial torture, of confiscation and banishment, next—from a spirit of antagonism to the nobility, which the latter reciprocated—the abolition of feudal rights, of caste privileges, and every monopoly of public offices. In religious matters the clergy confessed the decay of discipline and the need of reform, and some of them indicate as a remedy the convocation of a National Council and Provincial Synods, others, that plurality of benefices should be abolished, that the



clergy should be compelled to reside in their cures, that all titles to office should be derived from merit and virtue, some few recall the old popular elections and prefer the restriction of episcopal authority. None the less, the exclusive Catholic conception betrays itself and entirely dominates the Instructions, destroying at once the good results of the measures they ask for. The clergy demand that education shall be entrusted solely to the religious orders, that the University shall not receive professors unless proved to be adherents of the Catholic faith, that the censorship shall be maintained for all publications, that an ecclesiastical committee shall have the power to condemn any books opposed to the teaching of the Church, and that the Government shall then proceed to suppress them, that Catholicism shall be recognised as the sole and dominant religion, that certain provisions be made to the prejudice of non Catholics, that the concessions of civil rights and marriage given to the Protestants by the edict of 1787 be revoked.

But the two privileged orders could not express the feeling of the Nation. The Third Estate alone could do that. And, taken generally, the Instructions of the Third Estate affirm the sovereignty of the Nation, the necessity of a Declaration of Rights, of the convocation of the States-General independently of the will of any individual, the inviolability of the Deputies, and the responsibility of Ministers, next, freedom of conscience, freedom of the Press, freedom of internal trade, indi-

vidual liberty, suppression of State prisons and of exceptional jurisdictions Jurors are to be the judges of *fact*, indemnity is to be made to any prisoner declared to be innocent, the law is to be codified, property is to be equally divided among children, entail to be abolished Such are the demands of the several localities. Others claim an equal distribution of taxation, assessment by the provincial Estates, journeymen being exempt, others, the uniformity of weights and measures, the establishment of discount banks wherever the commercial conditions are favourable, boards of arbitration, free justice, a commercial code, others, the organisation of a public health department, hospitals, foundling asylums, the direction of education to the double purpose of developing in the pupils a strong physical constitution and a knowledge of the principles necessary to man and the French citizen, some few demand that ecclesiastical offices be filled by popular election, that the religious orders shall be totally or partially suppressed, that tithes shall be reduced, lotteries and gaming establishments abolished, they ask for the erection of country hospitals, offices for charitable-relief, work for the able bodied, aid to the sick, loans on easy terms to workmen and to cultivators of the soil

On this magnificent programme, of which I only give a rapid sketch, was superimposed, in the Instructions of the three orders, the twofold dogma of the

Christian World—Catholicism and Monarchy. The former was declared the religion of the State,—the latter asserted to be inseparable from the life of the Nation, hereditary and inviolable

But not one of the reforms they indicated advances beyond what I call the doctrine of the *individual* and of the Age from which we are trying to escape to-day. The conception of Life from which all those Instructions emanated was identical with that which I have already shewn as inspiring the Encyclopædists, and Montesquieu, and Rousseau. The *end* of human existence is for all of them material *well-being*, the means to reach it, *liberty*. They desire the inviolability of conscience, of the expression of thought, of action, of private correspondence, because "the natural liberty of *each* man, his *personal* security, his absolute independence from *all authority* except that of the written law, require it." *Liberty* in the Instructions given by Nemours and other localities is stated to be "the right of each man to do without hindrance whatever does not injure his fellow-men." "Men," say the Instructions of Nivernais and Rennes, "have only renounced the use of private force that they may be more effectively protected by public force, and this is the only source of the reciprocal obligations of citizens, of citizens towards Society, of Society towards them." From Paris, Marseilles, Nemours, Merindol, Aurons, St Vaast, Rosny, St Sulpice, Villers Cotteret, from twenty other places

there appears with one voice, the ruling principle of the Instructions, that "natural rights" shall constitute the "basis of the Government of France," that the "preservation of rights" is the "sole object" of political societies

This idea is so universal that it induces them to reject conscription in the organisation of the army, and to substitute *voluntary* enlistment, thus destroying, from reverence for the rights of the individual, one of the most sacred duties of a citizen, the duty of defending the Fatherland by arms, and it impels them to propose the abolition of the oath to defendants, to speak the Truth, from respect for the right of defence in the individual, forgetting that it is the *duty* of every man, whether accused or not, to speak the Truth

The acts of the Revolution will, I hope, demonstrate how this conception condemned it, in its first long stage, to waste its forces in the search for an impossible harmony between two opposing principles, and in a system of *guarantees*, ineffectual in *practical* organisation, instead of the *positive* and educational function of the Government. Now, this is the only vital point to be noted. The Instructions, important as they are, and based in great part on truth, show a consciousness, neither of the *mission* of life, nor of a collective *end*, nor of the law of Progress as a *method*, nor of *association* as a *means*, nor of aught else that passes beyond the horizon dimly viewed from the Christian heaven, or the science of the individual



## THE QUESTION OF THE EXILES.

*From "La Jeune Suisse"*

### I

*June 12, 1836*

WHEN, in the month of February 1831, I crossed the last boundary that separates my country from Switzerland, I felt as if I were placing my foot on holy ground, on the threshold of a temple. Five centuries of liberty looked down on me from those mountain heights. The air was cold, and nothing but snow lay around me. Although weak and ill, I experienced a sense of power, of strange warmth, almost as if something had been suddenly kindled in my soul. The mountain wind, biting and sharp, smote upon my ears. But I felt only the breath of the Spirit of the People that dwells among the giant Alps tenderly caressing my face. It was the spring-time of God that lasts through all eternity for those simple, just, and valorous men who have never suffered their habitation on earth to be profaned. It was the peace of souls, independence, holy equality, noble piety. I breathed in all those things. The snow seemed to me as some dazzling white veil of youth and



An icy wind from the north has breathed upon men's souls. It has frozen sympathy and stifled generous thoughts, and deadened and dried up all hearts. I hear unknown voices murmur words whose very sound was unknown till now on this republican soil. "Let us break with the exiles, and make our peace with the Governments, let us sacrifice this handful of agitators to them; let us exile the exiled, and cast upon their heads the crimes of which the Governments accuse us." And they draw up lists of the proscribed, they arbitrarily imprison the exiles against whom no accusation lies. Ninety individuals form a category of *suspects*. Informations are rewarded, a price is set on heads. The newspapers teem with calumnies. We are allowed no chance to defend ourselves. Branded like heads of cattle, we are destined, some for England, some for America. Why? In virtue of what right? What Code of Laws justifies the verdict? Where are the witnesses? Where is our defence? Persecution, as in ancient Venice, is based upon secret information. Our sentences are not supported either by common right or public law. There is no law for us, our present, our future, are given over to the tender mercies of *State Expediency*, to something uncertain and indefinite, to an authority blind and deaf, like Schiller's Inquisition, nameless like the atheist. And no influential patriot, no republican legislator raised his voice to protest, in the name of men to whom every form of protest is forbidden, and say, "The exiles are men."



they have the right to all human justice, every sentence that is not based upon the general law is iniquitous, every verdict which does not follow a public trial and a free untrammelled defence is a crime in the eyes of men and God" No! there is not one voice It would seem that the monarchies, in exiling us from the Fatherland, have exiled us from Humanity

From Humanity? Yes! And God knows that the pain I suffer as I write these words does not proceed from personal considerations I have never felt so deeply as I do to-day the truth of that saying of Lamennais. "May God send peace upon the poor exile, for, wherever he may be, he is alone" Alone? But no! He has the People with him

The People—and may my words echo afar to the honour of Switzerland, and for a comfort of our mothers—the People is good Wherever we have come into close contact with it, there has been interchange of love between us The People has the instinct of great misfortunes and deep pity The People—except when libels like those that are being disseminated make it halt a moment on its natural career—the people is with us, and gives us proofs of its sympathy It smites our persecutors with its contempt, and gives vent to its joy wherever the justice of our Cause is recognised perforce. In the very place where we are treated as enemies it proclaims us brothers Its cottage door is opened to shelter us from persecution We could tell of patriots



in high places, who are always regarded as the representatives of the great majority of its beliefs. And when, in the face of injustice and intolerance the Associations are dumb, when the best among the good wrap their heads in their cloaks and let oppression work its will, when not one of those who can frown at a few lines traced by a foreign hand, fearing, they say, lest an alien influence pervert the national genius, not one, I say, dares stand up and declare to the men whose weakness makes them messengers of royal embassies "You are digging, with its dishonour, your Nation's tomb, you are cementing an alliance between the soul and conscience of the Republic and the Diplomacy of palaces, you are giving the lie to the Principle inscribed on your banner." When this is so, what will the Peoples think? What will be the lessons they will draw for their future? How will they distinguish between the deeds of absolutism and those of a popular Government? How will they choose between the decrees of Louis Philippe's Prefects and the police circulars of Zurich and Berne? Woe unto us who dream of the religion of Christian Brotherhood on a soil whose government makes the *exiled* a caste of *political Pariahs*. Woe unto you, weak and inconsistent men, who slay ideas by degrading them, and put the Future one step further off. For that you shall surely answer, not to us—for long ago we have said to misfortune, "Be unto us a sister," for long ago we have chanted Luther's Hymn,

"God alone is our strength"—not to us, but to the Republican *principle*, to the *faith* that it represents, to your People and to Humanity

I write without hatred or bitterness. The former was ever unknown to me, but a deep indignation ploughs through my soul when I think how the liberty and dignity and honour of a People are being gambled away on the table of an Embassy, when I see the delegates of a Republic permitting a white slave trade to please the police of the Monarchies, when I hear fathers, brothers, husbands, speak, by their children's cradles, so lightly of *America* for other men who have lost all, whose one comfort it is perhaps to be able to view the Alps or Rhine, thinking of their Fatherland beyond. Are they conscious of what they are doing? Do they remember that we also, we exiles, have mothers, aged fathers, sisters? Do they realise what consequences their thoughtless words may have for them and us?

One day in 1834 a man came to me asking for a brother's help. He was an exile, and had been one for twenty years. He had sipped to the dregs the bitter cup that that exile fills for the poor and solitary. They had driven him from Berne to Geneva, from Geneva to France. France rejected him because he was unprovided with satisfactory papers. He had re-crossed that country on foot, and found refuge in Berne, where a few Italians took care of him. Again he was consigned to the gendarmes, and sent back to

Geneva There he was imprisoned for having dared to return, then driven away, on the ground of having no legal domicile I saw him when he had thus completed his third journey Tears ran down his cheeks as he told me the story of his misfortunes. Shortly afterwards he had a hunt to start for England And he departed, crossing Switzerland and France on foot

That man was a Neapolitan his name Carrocci  
He died crossing the sea

His father and mother are still living he had brothers and sisters God forgive the republicans who poisoned their days with sorrow They who murmur—between a smile and a shake of the hand—America, should think a little more seriously of the families of the men whom they would desire to drive there

## II

BIENNE, *July 1, 1836*

The question of the exiles is nearly settled at least in the opinion of the country, for, so far as the Government is concerned, who can tell or foresee what they may do We, thank God, are too far from the sources from which they draw their present inspirations, to be in a position to inform our readers of their intentions We are speaking now simply of public opinion, which is the only thing which represents the country to us now

Public opinion continues to consolidate, and is nearly unanimous in condemning the incomprehensible con-

duct of our police, and the still more incredible designs of a proscription *en masse*, of deportation, of the creation of a special court which some of our statesmen have dared to sketch out, but which, one is forced to hope, for the honour of the human race, they would never dare to put into execution. In view of the facts, in the face of the enquiry that is being held in Zurich, and the one at Berne, however much they try to envelop it with a mysterious terror—all the rumours of irruptions into Germany, of attempts at armed insurrection, of plots at the point of breaking out, all are scattered, like the calumnies they are, by a solemn verdict of acquittal. They dare not even mention it more. In spite of the activity of which we have had such proof, they have raked nothing up to justify the ridiculous theory that they attempted to impose on public credulity, not a gun, not a chest of arms, not a single plan of invasion, not a trace of an actual conspiracy, with any insurrectionary or other aim, not a scrap of paper to shew that we should move at any fixed day or hour—they have found nothing. Their discoveries are confined to a few documents, which, it is said, are evidence of the existence of an *Association*. Well, among brothers, an Association is in the nature of things, it is simply an echo of the ideas that to-day are germinating everywhere, and of which we make ourselves interpreters. Where is the crime of it? Where is the harm? What is there to punish? And,

supposing there are men who meet together in the bond of a belief frankly expressed and freely accepted, what are they guilty of? Here, where the *right of association* is formally recognised, under institutions whose very soul is *liberty*, how long have they qualified as a *conspiracy* deserving punishment, a thing which hurts nobody, and which aims only at organising, round any nucleus that offers, the holy war of ideas, of progress, of national independence and popular freedom?

It is idle to cheat ourselves the question is a serious one. Every time that exceptional measures are taken upon our soil against any person whatever, the responsibility is made to fall upon us patriots, whenever, through anybody's fault, any one of the inviolable rights which the Country recognises is suppressed, it is we who are threatened. There is no reason—we repeat for those who easily forget—there is no reason why the right of association which to-day is forbidden to foreigners, may not be refused to-morrow to natives, there is no reason for permitting us, partisans of *young* ideas as against *old* ideas, to call ourselves in our publications *Young Switzerland*, if there are men who claim the right to punish others because they think it their duty to head their writings, whether published or not, with *Young Germany* as the expression of a prophetic belief. If it does not happen, it is only because they dare not do it. If we all remain dumb, they will soon find the necessary courage.

And even were this not to happen, it is of little importance. Even if there was every possible guarantee—even if the future itself were in our hands, we should still feel it equally our duty to protest. We are not egotists. We watch and guard the Right. Wherever that Right appears there is the seal of Humanity, there are our brothers. Wherever that Right is violated, wherever the sanctity of the human person is profaned by injustice or caprice, we likewise feel ourselves injured in that which we hold most dear—in our faith, in our principles, in our hopes. We are all members one of another. And, in proclaiming our principles on the house-tops, we believe we are doing a patriotic task and a *National duty*, much more effectively than those, whoever they be, who show as a pretext or excuse for persecution, a curious zeal, either hypocritical or strangely misconceived, for the safety and independence of the Fatherland.

The safety and independence of the Fatherland are placed in its ancient virtues and in honour. Its enemies are they who betray those virtues and stain the honour of that republican flag which was planted on their fathers' graves. What do we gain from a precarious enjoyment of the right of association or printing, if the sanctity of that right is ignored, if we will not recognise it as the application of a universal Principle, a fragment of the Law of God, and teach our children to see in it nothing but a



simple *fact*? What is the value of Liberty, if with fear in her soul and shame on her forehead she must crawl, like some vile courtesan, from Embassy to Embassy, to beg a day's existence from the diplomatists of kings? Such Liberty is but a bitter derision, and like the mocking legend which an impious hand nailed on the cross of Christ, it is the eternal condemnation of the men who inscribe it on their banner and crucify the Just beneath

Woe to the men who ignore the exile's sanctity, trample on holy hospitality, speculate upon the isolation of the exile, and put a crown of thorns on the head that is consecrated by baptism of suffering and self-sacrifice! Woe to the people who can look on that spectacle unmoved, without impulse to raise their hands and cry "Those exiles are our brothers whom God sends to us, let us respect them and ourselves"! The liberty their fathers won will melt like ice beneath the sun at the first great ordeal. The tears their selfishness has drawn will testify against them, and blot out their glory and their name. Wherefore Christ said "Feed the hungry and give drink to him that is athirst" But Liberty is the bread of the soul, and hospitality the dew that God maketh to fall upon the good, that they may wet with it the brows that persecution has furrowed.

And we poison with bitter words and calumny the bread of misfortune of those who ask of us hospitality, and when we hunt them forth, we write in the

*livrets*\* of the workmen whom we suspect of loving their fatherland too dearly *There's no work for you*

And this we do to comply with the demands of some foreign 'Embassy' and all—so debased and blind are we—to stifle, were it in the power of men, that spirit of human Emancipation and Liberty which to-day is our sole defence, to consummate, whether we know it or not, the reaction that, for the past five years, has been at work throughout Europe with unflinching constancy an impious and cursed work, that substitutes might for right, fact for principle, matter for spirit, man for God, a work fatal to every republican institution, a work whose programme—expressed, in our opinion, clearly enough at Paris † in September 1835—is being carried out at Cracow by force, in Switzerland by dishonour!

For certainly you would not dare to tell a cultured country—you would not dare to tell us at least, unless you hunted it half ashamed—that your conduct is perfectly independent and free from foreign inspiration. The latter is transparent on every hand, it betrays itself in your slightest acts, it strews your path with contradictions; it directs your enquiries, draws up your lists of proscription. For two years you renounced the odious system which you have now unfortunately revived, you gave a pledge of tolerance and oblivion, those very men

\* *Livret*, a memorandum book in which is written by employers the date of the entry into, or discharge from, service, of their workmen or servants

† See Note, p. 5

against whom you have now unearthed a musty decree, lived among you for two years, seen and known by all your agents, you had them under your hand, you were able to judge their conduct, you told them implicitly, at least, to live free and tranquil.—and now, in a moment, you set upon them with a strange energy, with a kind of blind fury, which does not even allow you time to await the result of your enquiries. It has followed, too, the events of Cracow, the pretended discoveries that have no other foundation than the word of some Russian or Austrian sergeant-major, the demands made by Powers that encroach on your prerogatives, the secret dispatches whose existence the want of publicity in National affairs enabled you to conceal but not deny. And you call yourselves independent! You pretend it was the discovery of a conspiracy that started your persecutions, while already, before even the results of the Zurich enquiry are known, you drew up lists of ninety victims that were published in the newspapers twenty days ago! You say you are hunting the guilty, you tell us the government persecutions are directed only against those who are implicated in a plot whose design has not even been proved. All the same, there figure at the head of your lists of prescription, inserted in your circulars to the police and the Cantonal authorities, the names of peaceful, inoffensive men, while all the information you have been able to collect proves their complete innocence! You assert that the principal

agents of the pretended conspiracy are paid from abroad, and all the time you must know that while you have in your hands the proof of a correspondence between one of them and the agent of a foreign Court, you only display power against a few poor workmen, you vent your anger solely against a few defenceless exiles, you do not ask the foreign Governments to recall their guilty agents; you are tender to men whose errand is to establish in your country a kind of occult Government, a secret police, a centre, as has been proved again and again, of disorder and espionage and corruption

Then do not speak, or profane with your lips, the sacred words—Fatherland and Independence. The People, who through all this have remained pure and innocent, and who one day will make reparation for your crimes—the People alone have now the right to utter those words without a blush of shame

### III.

BIENNE, *July 12, 1836*

If there is one thing—after God and our love—that we can prescribe as a solace to those who suffer for the holy Cause, it is the undeniable homage which our enemies themselves render to liberty of thought and the omnipotence of Ideas by their savage and relentless persecutions

Fifty years ago men punished *deeds*, the material act, the violation of what was called the sovereign majesty,

rebellion against authority, insubordination towards any established order of things. They vented their anger against the individual who was guilty of open violence. No punishment was too great for the wicked man who dared to put his hand to the forbidden tree, but you could with prudence and skill teach with impunity that no forbidden fruit existed. Men were tortured and condemned to death, but death was chastisement, and torture was vengeance. Justice was *punitive*, but not *preventive*. Authority was supported on one side by the executioner, on the other by the scholar. The peasant that dared to lift his hand against the noble who ravished his wife was sent to languish in prison, but people laughed at Molière's satires on the nobles without weighing their importance. Actions were crushed, ideas were only despised. Honours were showered on Voltaire the destroyer, but Calas and De Barry were dragged to the scaffold.

To-day all is changed. *Principles* themselves are attacked: men are only regarded as their embodiment, the living symbols whom the enemy tries to destroy, but prefers to vilify, if the chance presents itself. *Ideas* are persecuted, the purer and more virtuous they are the greater the irritation they arouse. The reactionary, the immoral revolutionist, the man who is disorderly from habit or native vice, are struck at, without passion or violence: but woe to the men who encircle their thoughts with an aureole of faith and

disinterested devotion, and embody in them their very life, who dare to unfold them before the eyes of all, a spotless flag, a God in the sanctuary Woe to the men who make the revolutionary idea the most holy of apostolates, and keep it unspotted from the vulgar stains that *individualism* might soil it with, who wish to unite it to the Humanitarian Tradition, and identify it with the continuous and progressive revelation by which God pours his Spirit on the masses of mankind! For them there is neither pity nor truce. War to the Press! War to Association in any form! War to every pre-sentiment of the future! This is the fundamental idea that guides persecution to-day *Prosecution of tendencies* has been invented They have materialised all that is most prophetic, most ideal, in the manifestation of man's spiritual nature The phrase *propagandism* has been discovered—an admirably elastic term that embraces everything and defines nothing—and applied to everything and used to condemn everything Literary Young Germany is persecuted as well as political Young Germany. Princes have learned that every new literary School leads up in the very nature of things to a new political School, and that to every stage of intellectual emancipation there is a corresponding stage of material emancipation They vent their anger on the proscribed, not because there is any reason to fear their immediate action—it is well known that they have no material for it—but from dread of their double consecration

of misfortune and virtue. The vice that enervates the mind, the traffic that prostitutes it, have been elevated to a system. Everywhere, where it is possible, they are organising hostile opinion, rather than terror, because the former, it is hoped, will kill the *spirit*, while the latter only attacks the form. They are anxious, above all things, to introduce immorality among us. Thiers is placed at the head of royal France. Polignac is rejected. It is a complete system organised to that end.

It is, indeed, possible to put one man *hors de combat*, even a number of men, an entire *party*, but not an Idea. Now, the power that carries within itself the condemnation of every illegitimate, or arbitrary, or immoral Authority, is precisely this power of *Ideas*—and of *Ideas alone*. This is why Authority tries to smother them wherever and however it can. It finds no other way to save itself.

This is why we were called dreamers, utopians, inventors of ideas, why we were mocked at for our supposed mysticism, our religious conception, our application of idealism to politics. And now we are treated as conspirators, we are called plotters of treason, the Conservative party bespatters us with all their venom, we have all the hate of those who feel their doom is near. The daily press of the *Aristocracy* strives to rake together at the doors of the Embassies, insult and calumny against us. The men

of a Power that is false to its own origin threaten to crush us. Men have come, through a series of sophisms, to the belief that every beacon of light is a call to rebellion, that every effort of thought must infallibly be connected with a conspiracy.

What is the reason of this change? Is it not, perhaps, the most explicit testimony of the mighty power latent in the very least of those ideas that but yesterday were still treated with contempt. Can we have advanced so far as to have fraternised *thought* and *action*? Or, indeed, in other words, is not perchance, *thought* itself an *action* and gifted with its powers and characteristics?

This is the first idea that suggested itself after the last domiciliary visit with which we were honoured. And the same idea arises from the whole question of the exiles, from all that has been said and done during the past few weeks. We mention it now for the sake of those men who, although inscribed with us in the same party, and accepting the same flag, have—through impatience, or lack of intelligence, or because it was the fashion—attacked us in the past as *idealogue*s who are a hindrance in the struggle, and who neglect *facts* to lose themselves in some vague search after the impossible.

How could we so often stir the anger of men, powerful from rank or influence, if we were nothing but *dreamers*, if our voice of calmness and conviction, that preaches principles alone, were nothing but an empty



sound in the midst of the strife? Why do the friends of the aristocracy, or of the conservative doctrines prevalent among us, shower so large a share of their vulgar insults and foolish threats upon us, if our mission is never to realise any of our beliefs for the People whom they ignore or hate?

Translate your beliefs into action, you say, well and good. But why do those who worship *facts*, and reduce politics to a question of formal government, of administrative machinery, of mere economic reforms, why do they never *translate* their conceptions into facts? Let them point to a single one of their practical remedies whose efficacy can be proved sufficiently to secure its being tested. And if they succeeded in getting even one accepted, let them tell us whether that remedy did not, a few months after, prove valueless, and whether the improvements it was to produce were not monopolised by one class alone—by that class which possesses and jealously keeps, for its own advantage, every avenue to the administration of the State. All partial reforms imposed on a Society, corrupt and rotten at heart, are but instruments in favour of this class, since it alone, in the actual constitution of Society, is in a position to obtain any benefit from them.

We too, equally with them, might in our turn suggest, when necessary, new administrative or economic regulations. But what good would come of it? Would they be accepted? Or rather, would they not perhaps be

accepted in such a manner as to warp them before long from their true purpose—the social and general good?

Every Revolution is building on the sand that claims to change the *subject* without modifying the *agent*, or, in other words, that seeks to realise its own purpose, without effecting, in the name of some faith, or enthusiasm, or of the consecration of great principles, some degree of moral reform in the men who have to achieve it. We are building on the rock. By connecting politics with a philosophy of life, by raising them to the height of a religious conception, and by subordinating their results to a vast scheme of universal education, we shall indeed be later in attaining our purpose, but most assuredly we shall consummate it once and for ever.

To-day—after forty years of sanguinary experiences, after delusions such, that (if anything could justify despair when the salvation of all is at stake) the cowardly despondency that dominates a whole generation at the present day, would be sufficient apology—to-day, France herself is constrained to confess that she has not sufficiently matured her thought, and has therefore to set to work again. Germany, the land of *dreamers*, that has devoted the whole of her time to preparing the field of ideas, experiences to-day the greatest difficulty in abandoning it for the field of practice and facts, but be assured every step she takes upon the latter field will be an imperishable conquest. It is probable that she will progress very slowly, nevertheless, we may be certain

that she will neither stop nor retrace her steps Her Revolution may be delayed much longer than we could wish, but we firmly believe its results will be permanent and fruitful

Let us then pursue our way, continue our slow procedure as *sowers* of ideas, *miners* of thought We know well what is our goal Until to-day you have deluded us with treacherous promises and foolish hopes, and never won us a single important conquest By always beckoning us on to an immediate realisation of our hopes, you have made us lose precious time And now, to make up for it, we must have the consecration of ideas But remember we will never again turn aside our face from the goal, we will press towards it without ceasing, and, be assured, when we cancel an *idea*, we cancel with it a whole series of *facts*, and when we teach a new idea, we prepare the way for a new and complete series of material reforms that will result from it, not at once perhaps, but infallibly some day

The unjust Powers with whom we fight know this and curse us but their anathema is lost in the void like a straw borne by the wind The seed we sow will take root in soil that martyrs' blood has hallowed, and germinate beneath the breath of God And, if the plants that grow from it shall shoot only on our graves, our souls will bless God, and rejoice in another world

Persecute us then, but tremble! One day, before the flames that, at the Roman Senate's order, were con-

suming Cremutius Cordus' History, a Roman exclaimed, "Throw me also upon that pyre, for I know those books by heart" Yet a little while and Humanity will reply with such a cry to your petty persecutions. You strike down a few men, but the *idea* escapes your blows. It is immortal. It gains a giant's strength in the fury of the storm. Like a diamond, its splendour waxes brighter as every stroke that cuts it. For every instance of its working that you crush, it will find ten more. From day to day it penetrates and incarnates itself more and more in the conscience of Humanity, and, when you have emptied your anger and violence upon a few individuals who are only its forerunners, it will rise before you in all its democratic majesty. It will sweep over your heads like the sea over the sand, and destroy even the very memory of your resistance.



## AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER.

“MY DEAR SIR,—Although we saw one another only once, there was still something springing from the heart in our shaking of hands, which I have never forgotten, and now that you are plunged deep in grief, I remember it again, and feel as if I wanted to shake hands again and to tell you; ‘I do grieve with you Be strong in soul death is a sacred thing and ought to be felt as such keep sorrowful for the one you love, but let not your sorrow be the dry, barren atheistic sorrow of those who cannot look beyond this earth it would be a degradation of both yours and *his* own soul’

“I do not know what you believe or disbelieve in I do not believe in any existing religion, and cannot, therefore, be suspected of blindly following some tradition or educational influence But I have been thinking, deeply as I was capable of, all my life, about our law of life I have been looking for it through the history of mankind, and within my own conscience, and I have reached a conviction, never more to be shaken, that there is no such thing as Death, that

Life cannot be without being for ever, that indefinite progression is the law of life, that every capability, every thought, every aspiration given to us *must* have its practical development, that we have ideas, thoughts, aspirations, which go far beyond the possibility of our terrestrial life, that the very fact of our having them, and of our being unable to trace them to our senses, is a proof that they come to us from beyond earth, and may be realised out of it, that nothing except *forms* of being perish here down, and that to think that *we* die, because our form dies, is the same thing as to think that the *worker* is dead because his *implements* have been wearing out

“Since that belief came to me, tested likewise by intellect and heart, by mind and love, I have lost all—a sister excepted—that was dear to me in my own country I grieved, and grieve still, but never despairingly I felt the sacredness of Death I felt new duties of love arising before me I felt that I was never to forget the dear lost ones, that I was to grow truer, more loving towards others, more active in fulfilling duties, for their sake and mine I felt that they would grieve if I did not do so I felt that my doing so would probably hasten the moment in which we would meet again and fulfil the pledge contained in true, earnest, terrestrial love Before every grave I tried to improve, I kept faithful to the departed, and therefore sadder and sadder at their leaving me one

after the other, but firm and faithful to the feeling that my love is not a mere sensation, but a higher and holier thing, the budding of the flower, and a promise and a pledge that it will bloom out elsewhere, just as the flower has its roots under the soil and expands above.

"I wish that the same feeling was in you. I cannot pretend to awaken it within you if it is not there, although a noble tradition of the most powerful souls on earth has proclaimed it as I do. But let my having ventured to express it now to you prove, at least, that I have never lost the recollection of our meeting, and that I deeply sympathise with you and your wife in your loss and sorrow—Ever faithfully yours,

"JOSEPH MAZZINI."

2 ONSLOW TERRACE,  
FULHAM ROAD, S.W.  
*May 8th.*





## APPENDIX.

### NOTE ON THE REVOLUTION OF 1831

THE Revolution of Central Italy in 1831 was a sequel of the July Revolution in France. The Parisian Carbonari had been industriously connecting the threads of revolution in North and Central Italy. Early in February it broke out in Modena and Bologna, and within a fortnight all but a fraction of the Papal States and the Duchies of Modena and Parma, the mass in fact of Central Italy, with the exception of Tuscany, were in full revolt. The temporal power was abolished, a National Assembly was decreed, the Pope was on the point of flight. The Bolognese government had relied on French promises to protect them against Austrian aggression. One of the formulas of the July Revolution had been, that no nation should be allowed to interfere in the domestic concerns of another. The French ministers had protested that France would never allow the principle of non-intervention to be violated, and had promised to fight if Austria sent troops into the revolted provinces. At the same time they were sending Metternich private assurances to the contrary, and soon afterwards, throwing off the mask, they declared that "the blood of Frenchmen belongs to France alone." Free from French opposition, the Austrians easily overran Parma and Modena. When the Modenese forces retired into Romagna, the Provisional Government at Bologna, in pedantic observance of the non-intervention formula, still hoping against

light that France would insist on its observance by Austria, regarded them as belligerents entering a neutral territory and disarmed them. "None of our people," they said, "shall take part in our neighbours' quarrels." Their fears gave the lie to their high-sounding phrases of Italian unity and nationality, and took the life out of the struggle. A feeble retreat to Ancona, varied by some spirited fighting on the part of the volunteers at Rimini, was followed by complete surrender, and, though the Revolution broke out again at the end of the year, it was easily suppressed by the Papal troops.

The revolution has been, perhaps, over-hardly criticised by Mazzini and others. The irresolution and incompetency of its leaders, their pedantic belief in phrases, their incapacity to guide, admit of no defence. The lawyers and professors who directed it had small experience of public life. They thought they could sway men by maxims, and despised the spiritual forces that are the life-blood of a revolution. And so the people welcomed the revolution, but after the first few days had no enthusiasm for it. They chose their deputies for the Assembly, but were never made to feel their own responsibility and place in the new order. Men who under good leadership would have fought and perhaps conquered, found themselves isolated and paralysed, and resigned with hardly a struggle to the old hated rule. And yet it was in advance of the revolutions of Naples and Piedmont ten years before. In some respects it went ahead of popular feeling, and the abolition of the temporal power scandalized the masses outside the great cities. It accentuated, though with a somewhat uncertain voice, the nationalist bearings of the democratic movement. Italian liberalism too had broadened since 1821. It had spread from the army to the lawyers and tradesmen and artisans. Democracy no longer paraded in military full-dress. It had become bourgeois and unostentatious, and if it lacked

capacity and enthusiasm, it had gained in a certain plain solidity. There was a disinterestedness and probity about it that testified to the new spirit. Social reform had been absent from the programmes of the earlier revolutionists, it had now, *pace* Mazzini, come to the front, and the first days of freedom had been signalised by a long list of practical improvements in law and taxation and social rights.